

SEMI-AUTOREGRESSIVE STREAMING ASR WITH LABEL CONTEXT

Siddhant Arora¹, George Saon², Shinji Watanabe¹, Brian Kingsbury²

¹Carnegie Mellon University, ²IBM Research, Yorktown Heights, USA

ABSTRACT

Non-autoregressive (NAR) modeling has gained significant interest in speech processing since these models achieve dramatically lower inference time than autoregressive (AR) models while also achieving good transcription accuracy. Since NAR automatic speech recognition (ASR) models must wait for the completion of the entire utterance before processing, some works explore streaming NAR models based on blockwise attention for low-latency applications. However, streaming NAR models significantly lag in accuracy compared to streaming AR and non-streaming NAR models. To address this, we propose a *streaming “semi-autoregressive” ASR model* that incorporates the labels emitted in previous blocks as additional context using a Language Model (LM) subnetwork. We also introduce a novel greedy decoding algorithm that addresses insertion and deletion errors near block boundaries while not significantly increasing the inference time. Experiments show that our method outperforms the existing streaming NAR model by 19% relative on Tedlium2, 16%/8% on Librispeech-100 clean/other test sets, and 19%/8% on the Switchboard(SWB)/Callhome(CH) test sets. It also reduced the accuracy gap with streaming AR and non-streaming NAR models while achieving 2.5x lower latency. We also demonstrate that our approach can effectively utilize *external text data* to pre-train the LM subnetwork to further improve streaming ASR accuracy.

Index Terms— ASR, Streaming, CTC, Semi-Autoregressive

1. INTRODUCTION

End-to-end Speech Recognition (E2E ASR) systems [1–6] have been widely studied thanks to their many applications like voice assistants and intelligent home devices. Most E2E architectures, like Recurrent Neural Network Transducer (RNN-T) [5, 7, 8] and Attention Encoder Decoder (AED) [6, 9–12] systems, are Autoregressive (AR) models that condition on previous labels to make their predictions. While these AR models have achieved strong performance, their inference time increases with output length, thereby affecting user experience when they are deployed in interactive applications. To address this, prior works have introduced Non-Autoregressive (NAR) models [4, 13–18] that assume conditional independence on previously predicted labels and, hence, can output tokens concurrently. The Connectionist Temporal Classification (CTC) [4] loss is a NAR methodology that has been shown to achieve promising results while drastically reducing inference time.

However, these models must wait for the utterance to end before they can start processing and hence cannot be deployed in low-latency applications. Further, these approaches are mostly based on the Transformer [19–21] architecture where the memory and computation requirement grows quadratically with the length of the input, making them impractical for handling very long utterances. Some attempts have been made to create framewise streaming ASR models using unidirectional encoders for RNN-T or CTC models; however,

their performance is suboptimal [22] due to no access to the future context. Hence, there has been interest in blockwise processing encoders [23–26]. Prior work has tried to capture global information by introducing an additional context embedding vector [27] in each block. This approach paves the way for streaming ASR, achieved through blockwise synchronous inference [28, 29] of AED. Similar efforts [30–33] have developed low-latency RNN-T ASR systems.

Inspired by the success of NAR models for offline ASR, there has been an effort to build streaming NAR [34] models that combines blockwise attention with CTC models and proposes a dynamic overlapping strategy during greedy decoding to address insertion and deletion errors at block boundaries. While streaming NAR models achieve dramatically lower latency, their accuracy is significantly worse than streaming AR and non-streaming NAR models. Prior work on machine translation has shown promising results with a semi-autoregressive (SAR) [35, 36] model that retains the AR property globally but relaxes the AR property within local blocks. Motivated by this, we ask if we can encode labels predicted by previous blocks as additional context to improve streaming NAR accuracy without drastically increasing the inference time.

To this end, we propose a streaming SAR ASR model that performs greedy NAR decoding within a block but keeps the AR property across blocks by encoding the labels emitted at previous blocks using a Language Model (LM) subnetwork, effectively adding an additional “label” context vector in the contextual block encoder. This LM subnetwork is pretrained using a causal Language Modelling objective on text-only data, and hence provides *text injection* functionality. During training, we employ teacher forcing and generate context embeddings using forced alignments [37] obtained from CTC-based ASR models. Our entire model is trained using frame-wise cross-entropy loss, with the forced alignments serving as a proxy for ground truth alignments. We additionally experiment with intermediate CTC [18] and “random block” [38–41] regularisation. Finally, we apply a simple decoding strategy that combines the last few non-blank frames from the previous block with the frames in the current block during inference. We evaluated our approach on 3 publicly available datasets, Tedlium-2 [42], Librispeech-100 [43] and Switchboard [44]. Our results show that our proposed streaming SAR model reduces the accuracy gap with streaming AR and non-streaming NAR models while achieving 2.5x lower latency.

The key contributions of our work are (1) we introduce a novel streaming SAR ASR model that incorporates labels predicted from previous blocks as additional context, (2) we propose a novel decoding algorithm that improves over existing streaming NAR decoding strategies, and (3) we show that our approach can pretrain the LM subnetwork with external text to boost streaming ASR accuracy.

2. PROBLEM FORMULATION

In ASR, the input is a T -length sequence of speech features, $X = \{\mathbf{x}_t | t = 1, \dots, T\}$, and the goal is to predict the corresponding O -




Fig. 1: Schematics of our semi-autoregressive streaming ASR model

length transcript $Y = \{y_o | o = 1, \dots, O\}$. Through the maximum a posteriori (MAP) decision theory, the ASR model estimates the transcript by maximizing posterior probability $P(Y|X)$.

In the streaming NAR model [34], the input is represented by a sequence of B overlapping blocks, $U = \{U_b | b = 1, \dots, B\}$. Assuming a block size of L_{block} and a hop size of L_{hop} , the b^{th} block is $U_b = \mathbf{x}_{(I_{b-1}+1):(I_{b-1}+L_{\text{block}})}$ where $I_{b-1} = (b-1) * L_{\text{hop}}$. Let $A = \{a_t | t = 1, \dots, T\}$ be the *frame-level alignment* where a_t corresponds to the aligned transcript token for speech frame \mathbf{x}_t . Since the blocks overlap, streaming models [29] use the central L_{hop} frames from each block for prediction, excluding the first N_f frames as past frames and the last N_f frames as future frames for lookahead. We can approximate [4] posterior probability $P(Y|X) \approx \max_A P(A|X)$ and represent its logarithm as a sum of log-posteriors from overlapping blocks:

$$\log(P(Y|X)) \approx \sum_{b=1}^B \sum_{t=I_{b-1}+N_f+1}^{I_{b-1}+N_f+L_{\text{hop}}} \log(P(a_t | a_{1:t-1}, X)). \quad (1)$$

With the NAR [4] conditional independence (C.I.) assumption, $a_t \perp\!\!\!\perp a_{1:t-1} | X$, and the block processing [23–27] C.I. assumptions, $a_t \perp\!\!\!\perp U_{<b} | U_b^1$ and $a_t \perp\!\!\!\perp U_{>b} | U_b$, Eq. 1 simplifies to

$$\log(P(Y|X)) = \sum_{b=1}^B \sum_{t=I_{b-1}+N_f+1}^{I_{b-1}+N_f+L_{\text{hop}}} \log(P(a_t | U_b)). \quad (2)$$

We propose to preserve the AR property globally. We relax the NAR C.I. assumption and modify Eq. 2 by conditioning on labels emitted in previous blocks, $A_{b-1} = a_{1:(I_{b-1}+N_f)}$, using LM subnetwork:

$$\log(P(Y|X)) = \sum_{b=1}^B \sum_{t=I_{b-1}+N_f+1}^{I_{b-1}+N_f+L_{\text{hop}}} \log(P(a_t | \underbrace{A_{b-1}}_{\text{LM Sub-Net}}, U_b)). \quad (3)$$

By relaxing the NAR C.I. assumption, our formulation better approximates the original posterior distribution in Eq. 1. This formulation enhances the streaming NAR accuracy using the “label context”

embedding from the LM subnetwork while maintaining low latency by being able to output tokens concurrently within a block.

3. METHOD

To achieve the formulation described in Eq. 3, we propose the streaming SAR ASR model shown in Figure 1. For the b^{th} block, the output of the previous blocks A_{b-1} are passed through an LM subnetwork to produce the label context embedding $\mathbf{c}_{b-1}^{\text{lm}}$:

$$\mathbf{c}_{b-1}^{\text{lm}} = \text{LM}(\text{Normalize}(A_{b-1})), \quad (4)$$

where “Normalize” refers to removing repeated and blank tokens from alignments to make it similar to the transcripts used for training LMs such that $\text{Normalize}(A) = Y$.

The input speech features U_b for each block b are passed to the contextual block encoder (CBE) along with the context embeddings:

$$\mathbf{h}_b, \mathbf{c}_b^{\text{ac}} = \text{CBE}(U_b, \mathbf{c}_{b-1}^{\text{lm}}, \mathbf{c}_{b-1}^{\text{ac}}) \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{c}_{b-1}^{\text{ac}}$ is the previous acoustic context embedding and \mathbf{c}_b^{ac} is the next acoustic context embedding [27]. To train the model, we cannot employ an alignment-free CTC loss since we need to ensure that the frame-level output of our model aligns with the labels used for computing label context embeddings A_{b-1} in Eq. 4. This is crucial to prevent a train-test mismatch since we train using teacher forcing of alignments, while during inference the model utilizes labels produced in previous blocks. Consequently, we train our entire model utilizing frame-level cross-entropy loss, denoted as Loss_{CE} :

$$\text{Loss} = \text{Loss}_{\text{CE}}(\text{Softmax}(\text{Out}(U_{b=1}^B \mathbf{h}_b)), A) \quad (6)$$

where $\text{Out}(\cdot)$ denotes a linear layer that maps encoder output \mathbf{h}_b to the vocabulary size $|\mathcal{V}|$ followed by a softmax function.

3.1. Training and Inference

Algorithm 1 Alignment greedy decoding

- 1: $Y^{\text{out}} = [\emptyset]$;
 - 2: $A_0 = [\emptyset]$;
 - 3: $Y^{\text{prev}} = [\emptyset]$;
 - 4: $\mathbf{U} =$ Contextual Audio blocks iterators;
 - 5: **for** $b = 0$ to B **do**
 - 6: $\mathbf{c}_{b-1}^{\text{lm}} = \text{LM}(\text{Normalize}(A_{b-1}))$
 - 7: $A_b^{\text{out}} = \text{Argmax}(\text{Out}(\text{CBE}(U_b, \mathbf{c}_{b-1}^{\text{lm}})))$
 - 8: $A_b \leftarrow \{A_{b-1}, A_b^{\text{out}}\}$
 - 9: $A_b^{\text{out}} \leftarrow \{Y^{\text{prev}}, A_b^{\text{out}}\}$
 - 10: **if** A_b^{out} ends in non-blank token and is not final **then**
 - 11: $Y^{\text{prev}} =$ frames with ending token in A_b^{out} ;
 - 12: $A_b^{\text{out}} =$ remove frames with ending token in A_b^{out} ;
 - 13: **else**
 - 14: $Y^{\text{prev}} = [\emptyset]$;
 - 15: **end if**
 - 16: $Y_b = \text{Normalize}(A_b^{\text{out}})$
 - 17: $Y^{\text{out}} \leftarrow \{Y^{\text{out}}, Y_b\}$
 - 18: **end for**
 - 19: **return** Y^{out}
-

We use CTC forced alignments [37] from a pre-trained NAR ASR model as a proxy to obtain frame-level alignment A for training. We use A both for computing label context embeddings (see

¹[27] can potentially encode $U_{<b}$ using the acoustic context embedding

ID	Model	Encoder Type	Decode Mode	Tedlium-2		Librispeech-100			SWB		
				WER	Latency	Clean WER	Other WER	Latency	SWB WER	CH WER	Latency
A1	Non Streaming NAR	Transformer	Full Path	12.5	1102	12.2	30.1	1170	✗	✗	✗
A2			Greedy	12.9	391	12.3	30.3	408	✗	✗	✗
A3	(topline)	Conformer	Full Path	8.8	1806	8.8	22.8	1531	9.1	16.7	409
A4			Greedy	8.9	872	8.8	22.9	752	9.1	16.5	270
B1	Streaming AR	Transformer	Full Path	11.5	599	10.7	26.8	540	✗	✗	✗
B2		Conformer	Full Path	10.5	776	8.9	26.1	444	9.3	16.8	411
C1	Streaming NAR	Transformer	Full Path	14.9	327	12.5	32.7	305	✗	✗	✗
C2			Greedy	18.2	46	16.6	35.1	78	✗	✗	✗
C3			Overlap Greedy [34]	16.0	53	13.4	33.2	80	✗	✗	✗
C4		Conformer	Full Path	11.0	482	9.4	27.0	453	10.7	18.4	304
C5			Greedy	15.1	124	16.0	31.6	146	14.6	20.3	115
C6			Overlap Greedy	12.5	124	10.8	28.1	144	12.4	19.1	116
D1	Streaming NAR	Conformer	Full Path	12.0	487	9.8	28.1	454	10.5	17.7	303
D2	trained w/ alignment		Greedy	16.4	121	17.0	33.2	146	14.9	20.2	114
D3			Overlap Greedy	13.6	123	12.1	29.8	145	12.5	18.8	115
E1	Streaming SAR	Conformer	Overlap Greedy	11.7	143	12.3	29.2	188	12.4	18.8	133
E2			Alignment Greedy	10.5	140	9.6	26.9	188	10.4	17.7	137
E3		+InterCTC	Alignment Greedy	10.2	144	9.6	26.6	193	10.3	17.6	136
E4		+Random block	Alignment Greedy	10.1	149	9.1	26.1	188	10.1	17.5	136

Table 1: Results presenting ASR accuracy and latency (in msec.) of our semi-autoregressive (SAR) ASR system on Tedlium-2, Librispeech-100 and Switchboard dataset. Due to time constraints, we opted to report the performance of only conformer-based models for Switchboard, given their superior performance over transformer-based models on Librispeech-100 and Tedlium-2 datasets.

Eq. 4) and as ground truth for Cross Entropy Loss (see Eq. 6). Further, we pre-train the LM subnetwork using a causal LM objective on training transcripts Y . This formulation further allows us to *incorporate external text data* to pre-train the LM subnetwork.

During inference, we use the frame level output from the previous blocks as A_{b-1} to produce label context embeddings using Eq. 4. Prior works [34] have shown that the straightforward approach of splitting input audio into smaller blocks and performing greedy decoding on each block results in significant accuracy degradation. We similarly observed that most ASR errors occur when the segment boundary appears in the middle of a token, leading to repetitive recognition in 2 consecutive blocks. Based on this observation, we came up with a simple decoding strategy outlined in Algorithm 1, which we refer to as “alignment greedy decoding”. Let the frame-level output from each block be denoted by A_b^{out} , then the frame-level alignment A_{b-1} is first updated to A_b by appending it with A_b^{out} . If A_b^{out} ends with non-blank frames, this decoding removes the last non-blank frames Y^{prev} from the current block A_b^{out} and instead adds Y^{prev} to the next block A_{b+1}^{out} .

4. EXPERIMENTS

4.1. Datasets

To demonstrate the effectiveness of our streaming SAR model (see section 3), we conducted experiments on 3 publicly available English ASR datasets: Tedlium-2 [42], Librispeech-100 [43] and Switchboard (SWB) [44]. We quantify ASR accuracy using Word Error Rate (WER). For non-streaming models, latency is straightforwardly represented by the average decoding time per utterance. For streaming models, we calculate latency as $Latency = \frac{\sum_{utter}(\text{last token emitted} - \text{duration of speech})}{\text{\#total number of utterance}}$. Here, “last token emitted” denotes the moment when the model emits the final token, while “duration of speech” refers to the entire duration of the input audio. When computing the timestamp at which the model outputs the last token, we take into account both the lookahead time, which encompasses the time required before processing the next block can start, and the actual processing time.

4.2. Baseline

We compare our proposed streaming SAR model with streaming NAR and AR models. In addition, we include a non-streaming NAR model as a topline, demonstrating how our approach can effectively narrow the accuracy gap while maintaining significantly lower latency. Furthermore, we present the results of a streaming NAR model trained with frame-level cross-entropy loss (Eq. 6) using alignments to gain insights into the impact of alignment-based training. We also incorporate intermediate CTC [45] and “random block” regularization [38] techniques into our streaming SAR system.

4.3. Experimental Setups

For our NAR models, we employ a 12-layer transformer with a hidden dimension of 256 for Librispeech-100 and Tedlium2 datasets. Our conformer NAR model comprises 12 layers with a hidden dimension of 256 for Tedlium2 and SWB, while for Librispeech-100, it consists of 18 layers with a hidden dimension of 256. The streaming AR models are constructed with a contextual block encoder using $L_{block} = 40$, $L_{hop} = 16$, $N_l = 8$, $N_r = 16$ and share the same hyperparameters as the NAR models. The decoder for the streaming AR models is a 6 layer transformer. Streaming NAR baselines consist of the same hyperparameters as the streaming AR encoders. Our streaming SAR model shares the same blockwise encoder architecture as the streaming NAR model and incorporates an LM subnetwork. The LM subnetwork consists of an LSTM with 2 layers and a hidden dimension of 256 for Tedlium2, and 1 layer with a hidden dimension of 1024 for Librispeech-100 and SWB. We experiment with the incorporation of intermediate CTC [45] after the 6th layer with weight of 0.3. We also explore the effectiveness of “random block” regularization [38], where we randomly select block sizes from the range of [35, 45] during training, instead of using a fixed block size. We use bpe size of 500 for all datasets.

The streaming AR models are trained using joint CTC-attention training [10], while the streaming and non-streaming NAR models are trained using the CTC [4] loss. We train a streaming NAR model and our proposed streaming SAR models with cross-entropy

Model	WER
Streaming NAR trained w/ alignment	
streaming NAR alignment	13.6
non streaming NAR alignment	14.6
Streaming SAR	
LM subnetwork	11.7
w/o finetuning	12.0
w/o LM pre-training	12.4
Cross Attention	13.6

Table 2: Results presenting ablation on different ways of using alignment to incorporate label context. Results are shown for conformer based models with overlap decoding on Tedlium 2 dataset.

loss (Eq. 6) using frame-level alignments. As ground truth alignments are unavailable, we utilize forced alignments from the streaming conformer NAR model as a proxy. We train the LM subnetwork on training transcripts. We also experiment with training on external text data², including the transcripts of the entire Librispeech for the Librispeech-100 and the Fisher transcripts for the SWB SAR model.

We use both greedy and full-path decoding for the non-streaming NAR model. We run full-path decoding for the streaming AR and streaming NAR models via blockwise synchronous inference [28, 29]. Additionally, we employ greedy decoding along with dynamic mapping for overlapping inference [34] (referred to as “overlap decoding”) for our streaming NAR models. We perform inference for streaming SAR model using both “overlap decoding” and our proposed “alignment decoding” (see Algorithm 1). The inference of our models are performed using 4 parallel CPU (AMD EPYC 7763 @ 2.55 GHz) jobs with 64 GB memory. All model, training and inference parameters are selected based on validation accuracy.³

4.4. Results and Discussion

Table 1 presents the performance of our streaming SAR models alongside topline and baseline models. We observe that the streaming NAR model with greedy (C5) and overlap greedy (C6) decoding [34] achieves impressively low latency but significantly degrades accuracy compared to streaming AR (B2) and non-streaming NAR (A4) models. Our experiments reveal that training with alignments using cross-entropy loss mostly yield inferior results compared to training with CTC loss (D3 vs C6), possibly due to imperfections in frame-level alignments. Notably, our streaming SAR model improves accuracy (E1 vs D3) by incorporating the LM subnetwork to encode the label context. Additionally, our proposed “alignment decoding” proves to be a valuable enhancement, delivering a significant boost in accuracy (E2 vs E1) compared to the “overlap decoding” proposed in prior work [34]. Further improvements are achieved by introducing intermediate CTC (E3) and employing “random block” (E4) regularization. Our best-performing streaming SAR model (E4) surpasses the streaming NAR model with overlap decoding (C6) by a relative margin of 19% on Tedlium-2, 16%/8% on the clean/other test sets of Librispeech-100, 19%/8% on the Switchboard(SWB)/Callhome(CH) test sets of SWB with only a slight increase in latency. We further conduct significance tests and observe a p-value of less than 0.003 using Matched Pair, Signed Paired, Wilcoxon and McNemar tests for all test datasets. Moreover, our streaming SAR model outperforms the streaming NAR model

²<http://www.openslr.org/resources/11/librispeech-lm-norm.txt.gz>

³Full details regarding models, configuration files, and data preparation setup will be made publicly available as part of the ESPnet [3] toolkit.

LSTM-LM	Tedlium-2		Librispeech-100		
	Perplexity	WER	Perplexity	Clean WER	Other WER
2 layer, Dim 256	28.9	10.5	29.9	10.2	27.6
1 layer, Dim 1024	21.5	10.7	26.1	10.0	27.4
w/ external data	-	-	16.4	9.6	26.9

Table 3: Results presenting ablation on the impact of causal LM pre-training. Results are shown for the conformer based streaming SAR model with alignment decoding on Tedlium 2 and Librispeech-100 dataset along with perplexity of pre-trained LMs.

with full path decoding (E4 vs C4) by a relative 8%, 4%, 5% on Tedlium-2, Librispeech-100 and SWB, respectively, while achieving a 2.5x reduction in latency. Impressively, our proposed streaming SAR model effectively bridges the accuracy gap with non-streaming NAR models (E4, C6 vs A4) and can even match or surpass streaming AR models (E4 vs B2) on Tedlium2 and Librispeech-100 all while delivering a 5x and 2.5x faster processing speed respectively.

Ablation study on incorporating label context: Table 2 shows our findings for conformer based models with “overlap decoding” inference on Tedlium2 dataset. First, we experiment with using “forced alignment” from a non-streaming NAR model and observe that forced alignments from a streaming NAR model leads to better accuracy. In the case of the LM subnetwork, we explore not fine-tuning the LM during training of the streaming SAR model, which proves that proposed finetuning is effective. We also experiment with not pre-training the subnetwork on a causal LM objective, and again observe that our formulation of initialising the LM subnetwork is helpful. Additionally, we conduct an ablation study where, instead of using an LM subnetwork, we experiment with incorporating previously predicted labels using the multi-sequence cross-attention [46, 47] in the decoder and observe that our proposed formulation of having a LM subnetwork achieves better accuracy.

Ablation study on impact of causal LM pre-training: Table 3 shows the perplexity of different pre-trained language models (LMs) and their impact on streaming SAR accuracy. Our observations reveal that, for Tedlium2, there is no significant accuracy difference associated with a stronger LM. However, in the case of Librispeech-100, using a slightly superior LM results in an accuracy boost. Notably, the use of external text data further enhances accuracy, underscoring the effectiveness of our approach.

5. CONCLUSION

We introduce a novel streaming SAR model that performs NAR decoding within a block while maintaining the AR property across blocks by encoding labels emitted in previous blocks using an LM subnetwork. Our approach includes a simple alignment decoding algorithm that helps to mitigate recognition errors due to block boundaries. We demonstrate the effectiveness of pre-training the LM subnetwork with external text data. We also incorporate intermediate CTC and “random block” regularization. Our experiments reveal superior accuracy compared to streaming NAR models and also competitive accuracy with streaming AR models while achieving a 2.5x reduction in latency. Future work will explore the use of external text data via advanced LM [48] or CTC-based text injection [49].

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work used NCSA Delta through allocation CIS210014 from the Advanced Cyberinfrastructure Coordination Ecosystem: Services & Support (ACCESS) program, which is supported by NSF grants #2138259, #2138286, #2138307, #2137603, #2138296.

7. REFERENCES

- [1] R. Prabhavalkar *et al.*, “End-to-end speech recognition: A survey,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.03329*, 2023.
- [2] J. Li *et al.*, “Recent advances in end-to-end automatic speech recognition,” *APSIPA Transactions on Signal and Information Processing*, vol. 11, no. 1,
- [3] S. Watanabe *et al.*, “ESPnet: End-to-end speech processing toolkit,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, 2018.
- [4] A. Graves *et al.*, “Connectionist temporal classification: Labelling unsegmented sequence data with recurrent neural networks,” in *ICML 2006*, vol. 148, 2006, pp. 369–376.
- [5] A. Graves, “Sequence transduction with recurrent neural networks,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/1211.3711, 2012.
- [6] J. Chorowski *et al.*, “Attention-based models for speech recognition,” in *Proc. NeurIPS*, 2015, pp. 577–585.
- [7] A. Graves, A. Mohamed, and G. E. Hinton, “Speech recognition with deep recurrent neural networks,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2013.
- [8] G. Saon *et al.*, “Advancing RNN transducer technology for speech recognition,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2021, pp. 5654–5658.
- [9] W. Chan *et al.*, “Listen, attend and spell: A neural network for large vocabulary conversational speech recognition,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2016, pp. 4960–4964.
- [10] S. Kim, T. Hori, and S. Watanabe, “Joint CTC-attention based end-to-end speech recognition using multi-task learning,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2017.
- [11] T. Hori, S. Watanabe, and J. R. Hershey, “Joint CTC/attention decoding for end-to-end speech recognition,” in *Proc. ACL*, 2017, pp. 518–529.
- [12] Z. Tüske, K. Audhkhasi, and G. Saon, “Advancing sequence-to-sequence based speech recognition,” *Proc. Interspeech 2019*, pp. 3780–3784, 2019.
- [13] N. Chen *et al.*, “Listen and fill in the missing letters: Non-autoregressive transformer for speech recognition,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/1911.04908, 2019.
- [14] Z. Tian *et al.*, “Spike-triggered non-autoregressive transformer for end-to-end speech recognition,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, 2020.
- [15] Y. Higuchi *et al.*, “Mask CTC: non-autoregressive end-to-end ASR with CTC and mask predict,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, 2020.
- [16] Z. Gao *et al.*, “Paraformer: Fast and accurate parallel transformer for non-autoregressive end-to-end speech recognition,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, 2022, pp. 2063–2067.
- [17] J. Nozaki and T. Komatsu, “Relaxing the conditional independence assumption of ctc-based ASR by conditioning on intermediate predictions,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, 2021, pp. 3735–3739.
- [18] J. Lee and S. Watanabe, “Intermediate loss regularization for ctc-based speech recognition,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2102.03216, 2021.
- [19] A. Vaswani *et al.*, “Attention is all you need,” *Proc. NeurIPS*, vol. 30, pp. 5998–6008, 2017.
- [20] A. Gulati *et al.*, “Conformer: Convolution-augmented transformer for speech recognition,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, 2020, pp. 5036–5040.
- [21] P. Guo *et al.*, “Recent developments on espnet toolkit boosted by conformer,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2021, pp. 5874–5878.
- [22] J. Li *et al.*, “On the comparison of popular end-to-end models for large scale speech recognition,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, H. Meng, B. Xu, and T. F. Zheng, Eds., 2020, pp. 1–5.
- [23] N. Moritz, T. Hori, and J. L. Roux, “Streaming automatic speech recognition with the transformer model,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2020, pp. 6074–6078.
- [24] D. Povey *et al.*, “A time-restricted self-attention layer for ASR,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2018, pp. 5874–5878.
- [25] N. Jaitly *et al.*, “An online sequence-to-sequence model using partial conditioning,” in *Proc. NeurIPS*, 2016, pp. 5067–5075.
- [26] L. Dong, F. Wang, and B. Xu, “Self-attention aligner: A latency-control end-to-end model for ASR using self-attention network and chunk-hopping,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2019, pp. 5656–5660.
- [27] E. Tsunoo *et al.*, “Transformer ASR with contextual block processing,” in *Proc. ASRU*, 2019, pp. 427–433.
- [28] E. Tsunoo, Y. Kashiwagi, and S. Watanabe, “Streaming transformer ASR with blockwise synchronous inference,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2006.14941, 2020.
- [29] E. Tsunoo, Y. Kashiwagi, and S. Watanabe, “Streaming transformer asr with blockwise synchronous beam search,” in *Proc. SLT*, 2021, pp. 22–29.
- [30] A. Tripathi *et al.*, “Transformer transducer: One model unifying streaming and non-streaming speech recognition,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2010.03192, 2020.
- [31] M. Jain *et al.*, “RNN-T for latency controlled ASR with improved beam search,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/1911.01629, 2019.
- [32] E. Battenberg *et al.*, “Exploring neural transducers for end-to-end speech recognition,” in *Proc. ASRU*, 2017, pp. 206–213.
- [33] W. Wang, K. Hu, and T. N. Sainath, “Deliberation of streaming rnn-transducer by non-autoregressive decoding,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2022, pp. 7452–7456.
- [34] T. Wang *et al.*, “Streaming end-to-end ASR based on blockwise non-autoregressive models,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, 2021, pp. 3755–3759.
- [35] C. Wang, J. Zhang, and H. Chen, “Semi-autoregressive neural machine translation,” in *Proc. EMNLP*, 2018, pp. 479–488.
- [36] Y. Zhou *et al.*, “Semi-autoregressive transformer for image captioning,” in *ICCVW 2021*, 2021, pp. 3132–3136.
- [37] L. Kürzinger *et al.*, “Ctc-segmentation of large corpora for german end-to-end speech recognition,” in *SPECOM*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 12335, 2020, pp. 267–278.
- [38] K. Audhkhasi *et al.*, “Forget a bit to learn better: Soft forgetting for ctc-based automatic speech recognition,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, 2019, pp. 2618–2622.
- [39] S. Horiguchi *et al.*, “Online neural diarization of unlimited numbers of speakers using global and local attractors,” *TASLP*, vol. 31, pp. 706–720, 2023.
- [40] Z. Yao *et al.*, “Wenet: Production oriented streaming and non-streaming end-to-end speech recognition toolkit,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, H. Hermansky *et al.*, Eds., 2021, pp. 4054–4058.
- [41] Y. Sudo *et al.*, “Time-synchronous one-pass Beam Search for Parallel Online and Offline Transducers with Dynamic Block Training,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH 2023*, 2023, pp. 4479–4483.
- [42] A. Rousseau, P. Deléglise, and Y. Estève, “Enhancing the TED-LIUM corpus with selected data for language modeling and more TED talks,” in *LREC*, 2014, pp. 3935–3939.
- [43] V. Panayotov *et al.*, “Librispeech: An ASR corpus based on public domain audio books,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2015, pp. 5206–5210.
- [44] J. J. Godfrey, E. Holliman, and J. McDaniel, “SWITCHBOARD: telephone speech corpus for research and development,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 1992, pp. 517–520.
- [45] J. Lee and S. Watanabe, “Intermediate loss regularization for CTC-based speech recognition,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2021, pp. 6224–6228.
- [46] S. Arora *et al.*, “Token-level sequence labeling for spoken language understanding using compositional end-to-end models,” in *Findings of the EMNLP*, 2022, pp. 5419–5429.
- [47] J. Helcl, J. Libovický, and D. Varis, “CUNI system for the WMT18 multimodal translation task,” in *WMT*, 2018, pp. 616–623.
- [48] H. Touvron *et al.*, “Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2307.09288, 2023.
- [49] H. Sato *et al.*, “Text-only domain adaptation based on intermediate CTC,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, 2022, pp. 2208–2212.