

COMPRESSING TRANSFORMER-BASED SELF-SUPERVISED MODELS FOR SPEECH PROCESSING

Tzu-Quan Lin[†], Tsung-Huan Yang[†], Chun-Yao Chang[†], Kuang-Ming Chen[†],
Tzu-hsun Feng[†], Hung-yi Lee[†], Hao Tang[‡]

[†]National Taiwan University, [‡]University of Edinburgh

ABSTRACT

Despite the success of Transformers in self-supervised learning with applications to various downstream tasks, the computational cost of training and inference remains a major challenge for applying these models to a wide spectrum of devices. Several isolated attempts have been made to compress Transformers, prior to applying them to downstream tasks. In this work, we aim to provide context for the isolated results, studying several commonly used compression techniques, including weight pruning, head pruning, low-rank approximation, and knowledge distillation. We report wall-clock time, the number of parameters, and the number of multiply-accumulate operations for these techniques, charting the landscape of compressing Transformer-based self-supervised models.

Index Terms— self-supervised learning, weight pruning, low-rank approximation, knowledge distillation

1. INTRODUCTION

Self-supervised learning for speech processing has had a great success in scaling up with the increasing amount of unlabeled data, achieving strong performance in various tasks, such as automatic speech recognition (ASR), and speaker verification [1]. To make use of the large amount of unlabeled data, self-supervised models are typically large, for example, with 12 or more layers of Transformers [2, 3, 4, 5]. These large models are slow in runtime, requiring cutting-edge hardware, such as GPUs with sufficient memory. In this work, we focus on compressing Transformer-based self-supervised models, making them more efficient and suitable for a wide spectrum of devices and settings.

Model compression as a concept is broad. Any approach that returns a small yet performant model contributes to the trade-off and should be considered in the opportunity cost of compression. Common compression techniques, such as iterative pruning [6, 7, 8], low-rank approximation [9, 10, 11], and knowledge distillation [12], have little in common, another sign that the concept of model compression is broad. In fact, training a small model from random initialization and neural architecture search can both be treated as model compression, though nothing is really compressed. In this work, we limit the study to iterative pruning, low-rank approximation, and knowledge distillation. We also provide a simple baseline, where the forward process of the large model is stopped early. Stopping the forward process early not only reduces computation, but also maintains satisfactory performance because low layers are often already useful for downstream tasks [13].

Iterative pruning, low-rank approximation, and knowledge distillation, have been explored extensively in the supervised setting, for example, on automatic speech recognition [14] and machine translation [15]. However, only recently are these techniques applied

to self-supervised learning. Some study compression for a particular downstream task [16], while some aim to maintain the self-supervised loss [17, 18, 19, 20]. Moreover, unlike regular tasks with a single objective, there are multiple measurements to compare. In addition to the common accuracy measures, some compare the number of parameters [18], while some compare wall-clock time [20].

In this work, we focus on studying to what degree we can maintain self-supervised loss when compressing and to what degree maintaining the self-supervised loss leads to generalization to different downstream tasks. We make several contributions. We design a clean training pipeline to train a 12-layer Transformer with a simplified HuBERT loss, focusing on reproducibility. We compare iterative pruning, low-rank approximation, and knowledge distillation for compressing the pre-trained 12-layer Transformer. We also provide a comprehensive study of theoretical and practical speed-up of the compression techniques, measuring the wall-clock time, the number of parameters, and the number of multiply-accumulate operations (MACs) per one second speech, charting the landscape of compressing Transformer-based self-supervised models.

2. MELHUBERT

Since the loss is not accessible for the pre-trained HuBERT¹ we train a self-supervised model from random initialization. We make several changes to simplify the training pipeline, in line with the goal of model compression. Our model, MelHuBERT, is a regular 12-layer Transformer that directly takes Mel spectrograms as input, as opposed to wave samples in HuBERT. The 7 convolutional layers in HuBERT, accounting for 33% of MACs in HuBERT for producing 20-ms frames, are removed in MelHuBERT. We train two variants, MelHuBERT-10ms and MelHuBERT-20ms. MelHuBERT-10ms takes the typical Mel spectrograms at 10 ms frame period, while MelHuBERT-20ms splice every two frames to achieve a 20 ms frame period.

In addition to the slight modification in architecture, we also simplify the training objective. We first follow HuBERT, train a k-means model on Mel spectrograms, and quantize a sequence of frames into a sequence of cluster labels. Instead of using an ad-hoc training loss, we simply use cross entropy to predict the cluster labels for a masked input. The loss is only computed on the masked portion, similar to HuBERT.

3. MODEL COMPRESSION

In this section, we briefly review the specifics of model compression techniques used in this work, including weight pruning, head

¹<https://github.com/facebookresearch/fairseq>

pruning, low-rank approximation, knowledge distillation. Except knowledge distillation, the others can be seen as instances of iterative pruning. Iterative pruning performs the following two steps iteratively.

1. Prune a block of weights.
2. Train the pruned network until the loss converges.

What constitutes a block and how a block is chosen can be customized. Pruning can be implemented by zeroing out the chosen weights, or by avoiding the computation entirely. We do not consider one-shot pruning as it typically achieves a worse compression [21].

3.1. Weight Pruning

Weight pruning is one of the earliest pruning algorithms [22]. The idea is based on the finding that the increase in loss due to small changes to the weights of neural networks can be quickly recovered by a small amount of training. Weight pruning usually is an instance of iterative pruning, which converges faster and with lower training loss comparing to one-shot pruning. In this work, we adopt one of the simplest criterion for pruning [21, 7], setting the weight to zero when the absolute value is below a threshold. The threshold is determined based on the amount of remaining weights to be pruned, and we will have a schedule for the amounts to be pruned in the experiments.

We follow the usual implementation [7], using a binary mask to keep track of what weights are pruned. Weights that are pruned are never instantiated again. Since the mask does not exhibit any structure, speed-up of weight pruning can only come from sparse parallel computations or dedicated hardware [6]. In this work, we do not explore these options and only report theoretical speed-up.

3.2. Head Pruning

Head pruning is another iterative pruning technique [8], where the unit of a block is the set of key, query, and value weights for computing self-attention. Head pruning becomes an option when heads in Transformers are found not to be useful for particular tasks [23, 24]. Besides, pruning heads can lead to significant reduction in computation, considering the $O(T^2)$ computation for a sequence of length T to compute the self-attention.

Similar to weight pruning, we can specify a threshold on the L_1 norm of the weights, and prune heads based on the desired amount to be pruned. Another option [24] is to use a small data set $\{(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n)\}$ to compute a score

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \left\| V_k(x_i)^\top \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial V_k}(V_k(x_i), y_i) \right\|_1 \quad (1)$$

for each head k , where \mathcal{L} is the loss function, V_k is the attention multiplied by the value matrix, and $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial V_k}$ is its gradient. This quantity considers the L_1 of both the attention map and its gradient. This L_1 of the gradient is small when the attention map has little effect on the loss, suggesting the head is a good candidate to prune. Contrary to weight pruning, the computation of self-attention can be avoided entirely when pruned, so the approach can lead to speed-up without sparse operations or dedicated hardware.

3.3. Low-Rank Approximation

Low-rank approximation assumes that the weight matrix is low rank [9], and can be approximated by factorization, such as singular value

decomposition [25]. Transformers have two feed-forward layers after self-attentions, and the dimension after the first feed-forward layer is typically large (e.g., 3072). Most of the computation is due to the large dimension of this hidden layer. Despite having the nonlinearity between the two feed-forward layers, we find that the two weight matrices are both low rank. As a result, instead of doing matrix factorization, we prune the 3072-dimensional hidden layers. This amounts to pruning the columns of the first feed-forward layer and the corresponding rows of the second feed-forward layer based on the sum of their weight magnitudes.

3.4. Knowledge Distillation

Knowledge distillation trains a neural network (a student) to match parts of another neural network (a teacher) [26]. Matching the output of a teacher is the most common, while matching the hidden layers are also a viable option [27, 28]. In terms of the losses, KL divergence is commonly used to match probability outputs, while L_2 is often used to match the hidden vectors [29]. In this work, since MelHuBERT uses cross entropy for training, we simply use KL divergence as the distillation loss. There are several positive results with knowledge distillation, compressing self-supervised models [20, 18, 19].

4. EXPERIMENTS

Pre-training and the subsequent compression training are done on the 360-hour subset of LibriSpeech. For the downstream tasks, we conduct phone recognition on 100-hour subset of LibriSpeech, and speaker identification on VoxCeleb 1. All experiments follow default SUPERB settings [1], where the pre-trained models are frozen after pre-training and not fine-tuned.² The downstream tasks are allowed to use the weighted sum of the 12 layers produced by the Transformer, and the weights are learned together with the downstream models.

When measuring the rate of compression, we define density as the pruned amount over the total amount that can be pruned. For example, the density in head pruning is the amount of heads pruned over the total number of heads.

4.1. MelHuBERT

To train MelHuBERT-10ms and MelHuBERT-20ms, we first run k-means with 512 clusters on log Mel features extracted from the 360-hour subset of LibriSpeech. We then train a 12-layer Transformer to predict the cluster labels of each frame for MelHuBERT-10ms or every other frame for MelHuBERT-20ms. We choose a masking strategy that masks roughly the same amount of content, 7% of masking probability with a mask of 10 frames for MelHuBERT-10ms and 14% with a mask of 5 frames for MelHuBERT-20ms. To compare, HuBERT uses 8% of masking probability with a mask of 10 frames. Both MelHuBERT-10ms and MelHuBERT-20ms are trained on single RTX 3090 GPUs with Adam for 200 epochs, with an effective batch size of 32 and a learning rate of 10^{-4} . It requires about 220 hours to train MelHuBERT-10ms, and about 150 hours for MelHuBERT-20ms. Dropout of 10% is applied after the multiplication of matrices, such as query, key, and value matrices, and after FC1 and FC2.

Table 1 shows the downstream performance of MelHuBERT-10ms and MelHuBERT-20ms. We include a 6-layer LSTM trained

²<https://github.com/s3prl/s3prl>




Fig. 1. Downstream performance of compressed MelHuBERT-10ms on phoneme recognition and speaker identification for weight pruning, head pruning, and low-rank approximation. The dashed lines are the performance of the unpruned MelHuBERT-10ms.




Fig. 2. Phoneme recognition and speaker identification performance of weight-based and gradient-based head pruning on MelHuBERT-10ms. The dashed line is the performance of MelHuBERT-10ms.

with APC, with a time shift of 3 frames. We also include HuBERT for completeness, but it is not directly comparable due to an additional training stage and additional training data. MelHuBERT-20ms not only performs better than its 10 ms counterpart, but, as we will see soon, runs faster.

4.2. Weight Pruning

For weight pruning, we iteratively prune individual weights based on their L_1 for all weights and biases in linear layers of Transformers. We keep track the exponential moving average of the loss with a decay of 0.9998, and if the loss is within 0.001 compared to 15000 steps before, pruning is triggered. We use a pruning schedule that is aggressive when the network is dense, and mild when the network is sparse. In particular, we pruning 20% until 80% density, 10% until 50% density, 5% until 35% density, 2.5% until 30% density, 1% until 10% density, and 0.5% until 5% density. We use a batch size of 4 and a learning rate of 10^{-5} .

Results of weight pruning are shown in Figure 1 (a). We can maintain the pre-training loss until 55% density. For phone recognition, we can maintain the PER until 45% density. For speaker identification, the performance is in fact better until 30% density. When we reach 10% density, the performance only degrades by 1.7% and 3.7% absolute for phone recognition and speaker identification, respectively.

4.3. Head Pruning

For head pruning, recall that we have two approaches, one based on the L_1 of head weights, and the other based on the L_1 of gradients. For the weight-based approach, we prune a fixed amount of heads

for each layer, because higher layers tend to have larger L_1 . If we compare heads across layers, an entire layer would be pruned before we prune others. For the gradient-based approach, we use a 1/4 of the training data to compute the scores of each head. As opposed to pruning a fixed number for each layer, we normalize the scores of heads within each layer, and prune the heads by comparing them altogether. As for all iterative pruning approaches, we train the model for a fixed 25,000 steps after pruning, with learning rate 10^{-5} and a batch size of 4.

Results of head pruning is shown in Figure 2. We find that the gradient-based approach is better than the weight-based approach. Figure 1 (b) shows the gradient-based head pruning results comparing with other pruning techniques. We find that speaker identification is more susceptible to head pruning compared to phone recognition. In fact, head pruning improves phone recognition until density 50%. Overall, with a density of 25%, the performance only degrades by 0.9% and 3.4% absolute for phone recognition and speaker identification, respectively.

4.4. Low-Rank Approximation

For low-rank approximation, recall that we target the 3072-dimension output of FC1 layer. Reducing the dimension amounts to pruning the rows of FC1 and the columns of FC2 based on the sum of their L_1 . We prune 128 dimensions every 25,000 steps. We use a learning rate of 10^{-5} and a batch size of 4. Results are shown in Figure 1 (c). We see trends similar to other pruning methods, and can obtain an absolute 1.5% and 2.6% drop in phone recognition and speaker identification until density 40%.

4.5. Knowledge Distillation

For knowledge distillation, we explore a 2-layer and a 6-layer student network. Following [18], we study several design decisions, including masking strategy, initializing with MelHuBERT layers, and the temperature when training with KL divergence. Our baseline in this case is simply taking the first 2 or the first 6 layers from a pre-trained MelHuBERT. Overall, our results are negative. The distillation loss continues to drop as we train, but representation produced by the student does not perform better on the downstream tasks. This is consistent with the finding of others [19] in that the representation fails to be useful for the downstream tasks when the network is overly shallow. As shown in Figure 3, taking the first few layers in MelHuBERT performs better than knowledge distillation. Taking the first few layers in MelHuBERT does not even require any additional training compared to knowledge distillation.




Fig. 3. Real-time factor, MACs per one second speech, and the number of parameters for various compression techniques on MelHuBERT-10ms (top) and MelHuBERT-20ms (bottom). Real-time factor of weight pruning is not shown, as implementing sparse operations is beyond the scope of this paper. A 6-layer unidirectional LSTM trained with APC [30] (with real-time factor 99.8) is included for comparison. MelHuBERT-first2 and MelHuBERT-first6 are the first 2 and first 6 layers of MelHuBERT.

5. DISCUSSION

Results in Figure 1 are based on densities with respect to each individual techniques. The downstream performance can be compared, but the benefits due to compression are difficult to compare and particularly difficult to be fair to all techniques. We decide to report different aspects to evaluate the benefits of compression, including reduction in runtime on GPUs, reduction in MACs per one second speech, and reduction in parameters. Reduction in runtime on GPUs immediately transfers to speed-up when GPUs are available. Reduction in MACs shows the (theoretical) speed-up when large amounts of parallelization are not available. Reduction in parameters brings benefit to generalization, as we have shown in Figure 1. A small amount of pruning almost always improves the downstream performance.

The analyses are shown in Figure 3 for MelHuBERT-10ms and MelHuBERT-20ms, respectively. We find that weight pruning brings significant reduction in parameters and MACs per one second speech, without affecting the performance of phoneme recognition much. However, weight pruning introduces sparse matrices and does not enjoy real-time speed-up on GPUs. Significant speed-up with weight pruning is possible when there is no option for parallelization, for example, on devices where there is only a single processor.

Head pruning is effective in maintaining performance while improving all metrics. It is less effective in reducing parameters, because the parameters of Transformers are concentrated in the FC layers. However, computation of self-attention is expensive, and we find a significant reduction in MACs per one second speech and runtime on GPUs.

Low-rank approximation is effective in reducing the number of parameters, as the parameters are concentrated at the FC layers in Transformers. The improvement in runtime is less pronounced compared to head pruning.

Finally, we use the first 2 and first 6 layers of MelHuBERT as

Table 1. Downstream performance of MelHuBERT-10ms and MelHuBERT-20ms compared to APC and HuBERT.

	PR	SID
APC 6-layer LSTM	32.0	44.7
MelHuBERT-10ms	15.1	35.2
(first 6 layers)	24.1	34.1
(first 2 layers)	84.9	41.1
MelHuBERT-20ms	13.0	33.7
(first 6 layers)	19.0	33.5
(first 2 layers)	46.3	40.3
HuBERT	5.4	18.5

baselines (shown in Table 1). We find that removing the layers provides a strong trade-off across all metrics. Phonetic information is sufficiently accessible within the first 6 layers, while the speaker information is already accessible in the first 2 layers.

In this work, we study several common compression techniques for Transformer-based self-supervised models, including weight pruning, head pruning, low-rank approximation, and knowledge distillation. We provide a comprehensive analysis on the compression-performance trade-off, charting the landscape of model compression for Transformer-based self-supervised models.

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We thank the Taiwan Web Service for providing the computing resources. This work was supported by JSALT 2022 at JHU, with gift-funds from Amazon, Microsoft, and Google.

7. REFERENCES

- [1] Shu wen Yang, Po-Han Chi, Yung-Sung Chuang, Cheng-I Jeff Lai, Kushal Lakhotia, Yist Y. Lin, Andy T. Liu, Jiatong Shi, Xuankai Chang, Guan-Ting Lin, et al., “SUPERB: Speech Processing Universal PERFORMANCE Benchmark,” in *Interspeech*, 2021.
- [2] Alexei Baevski, Yuhao Zhou, Abdelrahman Mohamed, and Michael Auli, “wav2vec 2.0: A framework for self-supervised learning of speech representations,” *NeurIPS*, 2020.
- [3] Wei-Ning Hsu, Benjamin Bolte, Yao-Hung Hubert Tsai, Kushal Lakhotia, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Abdelrahman Mohamed, “HuBERT: Self-supervised speech representation learning by masked prediction of hidden units,” *TASLP*, 2021.
- [4] Sanyuan Chen, Chengyi Wang, Zhengyang Chen, Yu Wu, Shujie Liu, Zhuo Chen, Jinyu Li, Naoyuki Kanda, Takuya Yoshioka, Xiong Xiao, et al., “WavLM: Large-scale self-supervised pre-training for full stack speech processing,” *JSTSP*, 2022.
- [5] Yu-An Chung, Yu Zhang, Wei Han, Chung-Cheng Chiu, James Qin, Ruoming Pang, and Yonghui Wu, “w2v-BERT: Combining contrastive learning and masked language modeling for self-supervised speech pre-training,” in *ASRU*, 2021.
- [6] Song Han, Huizi Mao, and William J. Dally, “Deep compression: Compressing deep neural networks with pruning, trained quantization and Huffman coding,” in *ICLR*, 2016.
- [7] Jonathan Frankle and Michael Carbin, “The lottery ticket hypothesis: Finding sparse, trainable neural networks,” 2021.
- [8] Maximiliana Behnke and Kenneth Heafield, “Losing heads in the lottery: Pruning transformer attention in neural machine translation,” in *EMNLP*, 2020, pp. 2664–2674.
- [9] Tara N. Sainath, Brian Kingsbury, Vikas Sindhwani, Ebru Arisoy, and Bhuvana Ramabhadran, “Low-rank matrix factorization for deep neural network training with high-dimensional output targets,” in *ICASSP*, 2013.
- [10] Jaderberg Max, Vedaldi Andrea, and Zisserman Andrew, “Speeding up convolutional neural networks with low rank expansions,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1405.3866*, 2014.
- [11] Denton Emily, Zaremba Wojciech, Bruna Joan, n LeCun Yan, and Fergus Rob, “Exploiting linear structure within convolutional networks for efficient evaluation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1404.0736*, 2014.
- [12] Geoffrey Hinton, Oriol Vinyals, Jeff Dean, et al., “Distilling the knowledge in a neural network,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02531*, 2015.
- [13] Ankita Pasad, Ju-Chieh Chou, and Karen Livescu, “Layer-wise analysis of a self-supervised speech representation model,” in *ASRU*, 2021.
- [14] Rohit Prabhavalkar, Ouais Alsharif, Antoine Bruguier, and Lan McGraw, “On the compression of recurrent neural networks with an application to lvcsr acoustic modeling for embedded speech recognition,” in *ICASSP*, 2016.
- [15] Abigail See, Minh-Thang Luong, and Christopher D Manning, “Compression of neural machine translation models via pruning,” *CoNLL*, 2016.
- [16] Cheng-I Jeff Lai, Yang Zhang, Alexander H Liu, Shiyu Chang, Yi-Lun Liao, Yung-Sung Chuang, Kaizhi Qian, Sameer Khurana, David Cox, and Jim Glass, “PARP: Prune, adjust and re-prune for self-supervised speech recognition,” in *NeurIPS*, 2021.
- [17] Tianlong Chen, Jonathan Frankle, Shiyu Chang, Sijia Liu, Yang Zhang, Michael Carbin, and Zhangyang Wang, “The lottery tickets hypothesis for supervised and self-supervised pre-training in computer vision models,” in *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 16306–16316.
- [18] Heng-Jui Chang, Shu-wen Yang, and Hung-yi Lee, “DistilHuBERT: Speech representation learning by layer-wise distillation of hidden-unit BERT,” in *ICASSP*, 2022.
- [19] Rui Wang, Qibing Bai, Junyi Ao, Long Zhou, Zhixiang Xiong, Zhihua Wei, Yu Zhang, Tom Ko, and Haizhou Li, “LightHuBERT: Lightweight and configurable speech representation learning with once-for-all hidden-unit BERT,” *Interspeech*, 2022.
- [20] Yeonghyeon Lee, Kangwook Jang, Jahyun Goo, Youngmoon Jung, and Hoirin Kim, “FitHuBERT: Going thinner and deeper for knowledge distillation of speech self-supervised learning,” *Interspeech*, 2022.
- [21] Song Han, Jeff Pool, John Tran, and William J. Dally, “Learning both weights and connections for efficient neural networks,” in *NIPS*, 2015.
- [22] Yann Le Cun, John S. Denker, and Sara A. Solla, “Optimal brain damage,” in *NIPS*, 1990.
- [23] Elena Voita, David Talbot, Fedor Moiseev, Rico Sennrich, and Ivan Titov, “Analyzing multi-head self-attention: Specialized heads do the heavy lifting, the rest can be pruned,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.09418*, 2019.
- [24] Paul Michel, Omer Levy, and Graham Neubig, “Are sixteen heads really better than one?,” *NeurIPS*, 2019.
- [25] Yen-Chang Hsu, Ting Hua, Sungen Chang, Qian Lou, Yilin Shen, and Hongxia Jin, “Language model compression with weighted low-rank factorization,” *ICLR*, 2022.
- [26] Jimmy Ba and Rich Caruana, “Do deep nets really need to be deep?,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2014.
- [27] Adriana Romero, Nicolas Ballas, Samira Ebrahimi Kahou, Antoine Chassang, Carlo Gatta, and Yoshua Bengio, “Fitnets: Hints for thin deep nets,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6550*, 2014.
- [28] Gustavo Aguilar, Yuan Ling, Yu Zhang, Benjamin Yao, Xing Fan, and Chenlei Guo, “Knowledge distillation from internal representations,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2020.
- [29] Taehyeon Kim, Jaehoon Oh, NakYil Kim, Sangwook Cho, and Se-Young Yun, “Comparing Kullback-Leibler divergence and mean squared error loss in knowledge distillation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.08919*, 2021.
- [30] Yu-An Chung, Wei-Ning Hsu, Hao Tang, and James Glass, “An unsupervised autoregressive model for speech representation learning,” in *Interspeech*, 2019.