

DYNAMIC ALIGNMENT MASK CTC: IMPROVED MASK CTC WITH ALIGNED CROSS ENTROPY

Xulong Zhang^{1†}, Haobin Tang^{1,2†}, Jianzong Wang^{1*}, Ning Cheng¹, Jian Luo¹, Jing Xiao¹

¹Ping An Technology (Shenzhen) Co., Ltd.

²University of Science and Technology of China

ABSTRACT

Because of predicting all the target tokens in parallel, the non-autoregressive models greatly improve the decoding efficiency of speech recognition compared with traditional autoregressive models. In this work, we present dynamic alignment Mask CTC, introducing two methods: (1) Aligned Cross Entropy (AXE), finding the monotonic alignment that minimizes the cross-entropy loss through dynamic programming, (2) Dynamic Rectification, creating new training samples by replacing some masks with model predicted tokens. The AXE ignores the absolute position alignment between prediction and ground truth sentence and focuses on tokens matching in relative order. The dynamic rectification method makes the model capable of simulating the non-mask but possible wrong tokens, even if they have high confidence. Our experiments on WSJ dataset demonstrated that not only AXE loss but also the rectification method could improve the WER performance of Mask CTC.

Index Terms— Non-autoregressive ASR, Mask CTC, Aligned cross entropy

1. INTRODUCTION

Recently, end-to-end automated speech recognition (ASR) systems have received a lot of interest. There have been some prior efforts to realize non-autoregressive (NAR) models [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]. The most common method is Connectionist Temporal Classification (CTC) [6]. Wenet[7] applies CTC beam search to generate N -best candidates and uses the decoder to rescore the probabilities of these candidates, generating the final token sentence. Because the sentence length of candidates is fixed in the rescored process, it makes Wenet have a non-autoregressive structure and fast decoding speed. Conditional masked language model (CMLM) is another method adopted in non-autoregressive ASR models. CMLM has proved to be an effective model in various natural language processing (NLP) tasks [8, 9, 10], and has been introduced into ASR tasks recently. For instance, Imputer [11] optimizes the potential alignment of the CTC

iteratively by predicting the frame-level mask of the input speech. Compared with Imputer, Mask CTC [12] generates a shorter sequence by refining CTC output depending on mask token prediction. At the inference stage, the target sentence is initialized using the greedy CTC output. And then based on the CTC probability, tokens with low confidence are masked. In each iteration, optimization conditioned on the other observed tokens and the acoustic features is performed on the masked tokens. DLP Mask CTC [13] is an improved version of Mask CTC, which uses an additional predictor to estimate the length of local masks. In addition, DLP Mask CTC also employed Conformer [14] to enhance the encoder network architecture. DLP Mask CTC obtains a substantial recognition accuracy improvement over Mask CTC.

Despite achieving a high inference efficiency, the above non-autoregressive models still encounter some tough problems. One is that the decoder network of NAR model is usually trained on cross entropy (CE) loss, but the CE loss might be too strict for NAR model training. Cross entropy requires the force-alignment between the model predictions and ground truth tokens. It means that small shift in predicted tokens will result in large loss penalty, even if the content of tokens matches very well. Aligned cross entropy (AXE) [15] was proposed as a relaxed loss function for training non-autoregressive natural language processing (NLP) models. In machine translation tasks, CMLM models trained with AXE loss could significantly outperform the models trained with traditional CE loss [15]. In this work, we introduce the AXE loss to the decoder training of Mask CTC. We think AXE loss could make the model focus on the tokens matching instead of tokens ordering to improve the recognition accuracy of NAR speech recognition models.

Another issue is that the decoder input of Mask CTC is the greedy CTC search at the inference stage, while the ground truth sentence is inputted to the decoder at the training stage. This causes a mismatch between the training and inference. The high confidence tokens of CTC search are reserved as non-mask tokens. However, they may also have errors. These non-mask tokens could not be refined and influence the filling of neighbor mask tokens. In this paper, we propose a dynamic rectification method to alleviate this problem.

[†] Equal contribution.

^{*}Corresponding author: Jianzong Wang, jzwang@188.com.

2. PROPOSED METHOD




Fig. 1. Conformer Architecture of Dynamic Alignment Mask CTC with Mask and Dynamic Rectification Methods

We propose a non-autoregressive end-to-end automatic speech recognition framework. Our works are based on Mask CTC [12]. We try to improve Mask CTC by two methods: (1) aligned cross entropy θ_{axe} , finding a monotonic alignment to minimize the cross entropy loss on masked tokens, (2) dynamic rectification θ_{rec} , simulating the high confidence unmasked tokens by using model predictions, to produce new training samples. Aligned cross entropy is a relaxed loss, which ignores the absolute positions and focuses on the relative order and tokens matching. Dynamic rectification uses predicted tokens as the input of model decoder, closing to the greedy CTC search result at the inference procedure.

2.1. Model Architecture

As Figure 1 depicts, the proposed dynamic alignment Mask CTC is encoder-decoder model architecture built on Conformer [14] (or Transformer [16]) blocks. The encoder transforms a speech acoustic feature sequence $X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_T)$ to a hidden representation H . The decoder network outputs

a text label sentence $Y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_S)$. We apply CTC to the encoder output H , and the Aligned Cross Entropy (AXE) objective is used to train the decoder. Frame-level alignment A is predicted by CTC between the input sequence X and the output sentence Y . The definition of the CTC loss [6] is stated below:

$$\mathcal{L}_{ctc} \triangleq -\ln P_{ctc}(Y|X) = -\ln \sum_{A \in \beta^{-1}(Y)} P(A|X) \quad (1)$$

where $P(Y|X)$ is the probability over all possible paths. $\beta^{-1}(Y)$ returns all possible alignments compatible with Y .

At the training stage of dynamic alignment Mask CTC, we firstly applied mask method θ_{mask} on ground truth target sentence Y to produce $Y_{mask} = \theta_{mask}(Y)$. Secondly, dynamic rectification method θ_{rec} modifies the decoder input sentence to $Y_{rec} = \theta_{rec}(Y_{mask}) = \theta_{rec}(\theta_{mask}(Y))$. Then, the decoder predicts the whole label sentence Y conditioning on the input audio X and modified token sentence Y_{rec} as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{axe} &\triangleq -\ln P_{axe}(Y|Y_{rec}, X) \\ &= -\sum_{i=1}^S \ln P_{\alpha(i)}(y_i|Y_{rec}, X) - \sum_k \ln P_k(\epsilon|Y_{rec}, X) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Here, we introduce the Aligned Cross Entropy (AXE) loss [15] to the training of decoder instead of CMLM loss in Mask CTC. In which, $P_{\alpha(i)}(y_i|Y_{rec}, X)$ denotes an aligned cross entropy between Y and $\tilde{Y}$. $P_k(\epsilon|Y_{rec}, X)$ denotes a penalty for unaligned predictions, which is noted as a special token ϵ . k is the index of unaligned tokens in $\tilde{Y}$. Finally, through the CTC loss $\mathcal{L}_{ctc}$ and AXE loss $\mathcal{L}_{axe}$, the overall loss $\mathcal{L}$ of dynamic alignment Mask CTC is calculated with scale factor $\lambda \in [0, 1]$.

$$\mathcal{L} = \lambda \mathcal{L}_{ctc} + (1 - \lambda) \mathcal{L}_{axe} \quad (3)$$

2.2. Mask Method and Dynamic Rectification

As illustrated in Table 1, the mask method starts with an input text sentence Y . For training, Y is ground truth sentence of labeled data. For inference, Y is the greedy CTC search result without using beam search like Mask CTC. At training stage, the ground truth tokens are randomly substituted with $\langle mask \rangle$. The number of mask tokens is sampled from uniform distribution between 1 to L_{mask} . During inference, we mask the positions with low confidence below the threshold P_{thres} . Therefore, the masked sentence

Table 1. Illustration of Mask Method and Dynamic Rectification

Y	This	is	dynamic	alignment	mask	CTC	non	autoregressive	speech	recognition
Y_{mask}	This	$\langle mask \rangle$	dynamic	$\langle mask \rangle$	$\langle mask \rangle$	CTC	non	$\langle mask \rangle$	$\langle mask \rangle$	recognition
$\tilde{Y}$	This	is	dynamic	alignment	task	CTC	non	autoregressive	speech	recognition
Y_{rec}	This	is	$\langle mask \rangle$	$\langle mask \rangle$	task	CTC	$\langle mask \rangle$	autoregressive	speech	recognition

Y_{mask} could be obtained through this mask method θ_{mask} by $Y_{mask} = \theta_{mask}(Y)$.

During training, we use current best ASR model to predict text sentence $\tilde{Y}$ from the mask method output Y_{mask} . $\tilde{Y}$ will fill the masks of Y_{mask} with the highest confidence in these mask locations. After that, the dynamic rectification method masks the text sentence Y_{rec} again. The number of second rectification masks is between 1 to L_{rec} . Through dynamic rectification, the output sentence Y_{rec} will not only contains mask tokens but also may contain wrong predicted tokens with high confidence. It simulates the result of greedy CTC at the inference stage and alleviates the mismatch problem of decoder input between training and inference.

2.3. Aligned Cross Entropy

The AXE loss is the minimum over all possible monotonic alignments $\alpha : \tilde{Y} \rightarrow Y$ of the conditional cross entropy loss as shown in Eq. 2. Dynamic programming is used by AXE to determine the optimal alignment between the current prediction $\tilde{Y}_j$ and ground truth token Y_i . The matrix $M_{i,j}$ ($i, j \in [1 : S]$) represents the minimal AXE loss value for this optimal alignment. Three local update operators are defined in the dynamic programming of AXE loss [15]: (1) align, aligning the current prediction $\tilde{Y}_j$ and ground truth token Y_i with probability $P(\tilde{Y}_j|Y_i, X)$, (2) skip_prediction, skipping the current prediction $\tilde{Y}_j$ and inserting a special token ε to the ground truth token Y_i , (3) skip_target, skipping the current ground truth token Y_i without incrementing the prediction j . This operation is penalized with the hyperparameter γ .

$$align = M_{i-1,j-1} - \log P(\tilde{Y}_j|Y_i, X) \quad (4)$$

$$skip_prediction = M_{i,j-1} - \log P(\varepsilon|Y_i, X) \quad (5)$$

$$skip_target = M_{i-1,j} - \gamma \cdot \log P(\tilde{Y}_j|Y_i, X) \quad (6)$$

$A_{i,j}$ is filled by taking the minimum from above three possible operators. After dynamic programming, the cross entropy loss of the optimal alignment will be present in the cell $M_{S,S}$. With AXE loss, the emphasis is placed on the expected token matching rather than the penalty for token order mistakes. Otherwise, the traditional CE loss is a too strict criterion for small token shifts in $\langle mask \rangle$ locations.

2.4. Decoding Strategy

At inference stage of dynamic alignment Mask CTC, the ground truth sentence Y is replaced by greedy search result of CTC decoding. We also applied mask method on Y to obtain Y_{mask} . But we do not use dynamic rectification, which is only activated at training stage. Therefore, Y_{mask} is directly as the input of decoder, to get the final predicted sentence $\tilde{Y}$. We apply the iterative decoding methods with K total decoding iterations. For each iteration, the decoder predicts

the masked locations $\tilde{y}_m$ in sentence $\tilde{Y}$ as follows:

$$\tilde{y}_m = \arg \max_w P_{axe}(\tilde{y}_m = w|Y_{mask}, X) \quad (7)$$

Then, top C masked tokens with the highest probability are reserved, where C is the average number of mask tokens for K iterations. Other masked tokens are changed to masks for the next iteration. Until all the mask tokens are filled, the decoding method terminates.

3. EXPERIMENTS

3.1. Configuration

We perform all the experiments on public speech corpus, WSJ1 [17] and WSJ0 [18]. We use si284, dev93, and eval92 for training, validation, and testing respectively. All the experiments are conducted on the ESPNET2 toolkit [19].

For the network inputs, the audio data is encoded with 80 mel-scale filterbank coefficients with 3-dimensional pitch features extracted using Kaldi recipe. We use speed perturbation [20] and SpecAugment [21] as data augmentation techniques to avoid model overfitting. The Transformer encoder consists of 2 CNN layers and 12 self-attention layers. 12 Conformer blocks make up the conformer encoder. The decoder consists of 6 self-attention layers. The multi-head attention has 4 heads, 256 dimension, and 2048 feedforward dimension. The dimension of decoder output is 65 (including capital English letters, masks, and punctuations). The final model was derived by averaging the top 30 models based on their validation accuracy after the training process. The scale factor λ of CTC and AXE loss is set to 0.3. During inference, the CTC confidence threshold P_{thres} is 0.999.

3.2. Results

We first explore the effectiveness of different modules of our dynamic alignment Mask CTC model as follows: 1) **Mask + CE**: The model trained with the joint CTC and CE loss. This is the baseline Mask CTC model; 2) **Mask + AXE**: The model which is only processed by mask method, and is trained on joint CTC and AXE loss; 3) **Mask + Rec + AXE**: We apply mask and dynamic rectification methods to create training samples and train this model on joint CTC and AXE loss.

All models are evaluated by WER (Word Error Rate) and RTF (Real Time Factor). As listed in Table 2, we compared the results of our models with baseline Mask + CE model. When replacing the traditional CE loss with AXE loss, the WER result of Mask + AXE model will decrease significantly. The Conformer encoder outperforms the Transformer encoder, and they have equivalent RTF speed. With dynamic rectification method, the Mask + Rec + AXE model could further improve the WER results on both dev93 and eval92 dataset. In addition, we also investigate different parameters in decoding procedure. With more decoding iterations, the

Table 2. Different Training Methods and Decoding Iterations, WER and RTF Results on WSJ

Training Method	Iter	dev93	eval92	RTF
Transformer				
Mask + CE	1	16.8	14.3	0.04
Mask + AXE	1	15.8	12.5	0.04
Mask + Rec + AXE	1	15.3	11.8	0.04
Mask + CE	10	16.5	13.9	0.07
Mask + AXE	10	15.7	12.2	0.07
Mask + Rec + AXE	10	15.2	11.6	0.07
Conformer				
Mask + CE	1	14.6	12.1	0.04
Mask + AXE	1	13.9	11.4	0.04
Mask + Rec + AXE	1	13.7	11.3	0.04
Mask + CE	10	14.1	11.7	0.07
Mask + AXE	10	13.7	11.2	0.07
Mask + Rec + AXE	10	13.6	11.1	0.07

WER performance of the model will become better. The results also demonstrated that our models are insensitive to decoding parameters. When the iteration number K is changed from 10 to 1, it suffers only a little degradation on WER results. However, it gains a huge inference speed promotion with a relatively 75% improvement on RTF performance.

3.3. Analysis

We contrast different autoregressive and non-autoregressive approaches with our best Mask + Rec + AXE model. As shown in Table 3, our dynamic alignment Mask CTC model achieves better WER results than vanilla Mask CTC* (our results) at both Transformer and Conformer architecture. The results also indicate that our method outperforms most previous non-autoregressive methods. In addition, DLP Mask CTC needs an additional predictor to estimate the length of masks, resulting in a more complicated model structure but slightly better performance. Our methods could be easily applied to similar length predictions with a lighter structure.

To investigate how AXE loss improves the model training, we plot the scatter diagram between training loss and Levenshtein distance in Figure 2. The Levenshtein distance is calculated by ground truth sentence and predicted output by iterative decoding with maximum token probability. The figures show that both AXE and CE loss have a linear relationship




Fig. 2. Relationship Between Training Loss and Levenshtein Distance of Ground Truth and Predicted Sentences

Table 3. Compared with Other Non-Autoregressive and Autoregressive Methods, WER and RTF Results on WSJ

Model	Iter	dev93	eval92	RTF
Autoregressive				
<i>Transformer</i>				
CTC-Attention	S	13.5	10.9	4.62
<i>Conformer</i>				
CTC-Attention	S	11.1	8.5	5.09
Non-Autoregressive Previous Work				
<i>Transformer</i>				
CTC	1	19.4	15.5	0.03
Mask CTC*	10	16.5	13.9	0.06
Mask CTC + DLP	10	13.8	10.8	0.07
Imputer (IM)	8	-	16.5	-
Imputer (DP)	8	-	12.7	-
Align-Refine	10	13.7	11.4	0.06
<i>Conformer</i>				
CTC	1	13.0	10.8	0.03
Mask CTC*	10	14.1	11.7	0.06
Mask CTC + DLP	10	11.3	9.1	0.08
Our Work				
<i>Transformer</i>				
Proposed	10	15.2	11.6	0.07
<i>Conformer</i>				
Proposed	10	13.6	11.1	0.07

with Levenshtein distance. However, there are two kinds of outliers for CE loss (see red boxes in Figure 2(a)). The first outliers have large CE loss but have small Levenshtein distance, mainly caused by token order mismatch, even if their edit distance is small. By contrary, the AXE will have reasonable loss value by relieving this order mismatch penalty. In addition, the second outliers have small CE loss, but their predictions are quite different from ground truth sentence. We conjecture that multimodality could still be a problem for CE loss. For example, “form or” and “for more” have similar pronunciations and may have both high token probabilities and low CE losses. Instead, their AXE losses will be quite different (see Figure 2(b)).

4. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we propose an end-to-end NAR speech recognition model, dynamic alignment Mask CTC. The AXE loss makes the model focus on the tokens matching and relaxes the restriction of tokens order. The dynamic rectification could reduce the mismatch of decoder input between training and inference, simulating the high confidence but possible wrong tokens of greedy CTC output. Experimental results demonstrate that our proposed model outperforms the vanilla Mask CTC model in terms of WER.

5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Supported by the Key Research and Development Program of Guangdong Province (grant No. 2021B0101400003) and Corresponding author is Jianzong Wang (jzwang@188.com).

6. REFERENCES

- [1] Xingchen Song, Zhiyong Wu, Yiheng Huang, Chao Weng, Dan Su, and Helen Meng, “Non-autoregressive transformer asr with ctc-enhanced decoder input,” in *ICASSP*, 2021, pp. 5894–5898.
- [2] Ruchao Fan, Wei Chu, Peng Chang, and Jing Xiao, “Cass-nat: Ctc alignment-based single step non-autoregressive transformer for speech recognition,” in *ICASSP*, 2021, pp. 5889–5893.
- [3] Zhengkun Tian, Jiangyan Yi, Jianhua Tao, Ye Bai, Shuai Zhang, and Zhengqi Wen, “Spike-triggered non-autoregressive transformer for end-to-end speech recognition,” in *INTERSPEECH*, 2020, pp. 5026–5030.
- [4] Ye Bai, Jiangyan Yi, Jianhua Tao, Zhengkun Tian, Zhengqi Wen, and Shuai Zhang, “Listen attentively, and spell once: Whole sentence generation via a non-autoregressive architecture for low-latency speech recognition,” in *INTERSPEECH*, 2020, pp. 3381–3385.
- [5] Somshubra Majumdar, Jagadeesh Balam, Oleksii Hrinchuk, Vitaly Lavrukhin, Vahid Noroozi, and Boris Ginsburg, “Citrinet: Closing the gap between non-autoregressive and autoregressive end-to-end models for automatic speech recognition,” in *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.01721*, 2021.
- [6] Alex Graves, Santiago Fernández, Faustino Gomez, and Jürgen Schmidhuber, “Connectionist temporal classification: labelling unsegmented sequence data with recurrent neural networks,” in *ICML*, 2006, pp. 369–376.
- [7] Binbin Zhang, Di Wu, Chao Yang, Xiaoyu Chen, Zhen-dong Peng, Xiangming Wang, Zhuoyuan Yao, Xiong Wang, Fan Yu, Lei Xie, et al., “Wenet: Production first and production ready end-to-end speech recognition toolkit,” in *INTERSPEECH*, 2021, pp. 4054–4058.
- [8] Ming-Wei Devlin, Jacoband Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova, “Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding,” in *IEEE International Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (NAACL)*, 2019, pp. 4171–4186.
- [9] Marjan Ghazvininejad, Omer Levy, Yinhan Liu, and Luke Zettlemoyer, “Mask-predict: Parallel decoding of conditional masked language models,” in *EMNLP*, 2019, pp. 6111–6120.
- [10] Marjan Ghazvininejad, Omer Levy, and Luke Zettlemoyer, “Semi-autoregressive training improves mask-predict decoding,” in *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08785*, 2020.
- [11] William Chan, Chitwan Saharia, Geoffrey Hinton, Mohammad Norouzi, and Navdeep Jaitly, “Imputer: Sequence modelling via imputation and dynamic programming,” in *ICML*, 2020, pp. 1403–1413.
- [12] Yosuke Higuchi, Shinji Watanabe, Nanxin Chen, Tetsuji Ogawa, and Tetsunori Kobayashi, “Mask ctc: Non-autoregressive end-to-end asr with ctc and mask predict,” in *INTERSPEECH*, 2020, pp. 6112–6121.
- [13] Yosuke Higuchi, Hirofumi Inaguma, Shinji Watanabe, Tetsuji Ogawa, and Tetsunori Kobayashi, “Improved mask-ctc for non-autoregressive end-to-end asr,” in *ICASSP*, 2020, pp. 8363–8367.
- [14] Anmol Gulati, James Qin, Chung-Cheng Chiu, Niki Parmar, Yu Zhang, Wei Han, Shibo Wang, Zhengdong Zhang, Yonghui Wu, and Ruoming Pang, “Conformer: Convolution-augmented transformer for speech recognition,” in *INTERSPEECH*, 2020, pp. 5036–5040.
- [15] Marjan Ghazvininejad, Vladimir Karpukhin, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Omer Levy, “Aligned cross entropy for non-autoregressive machine translation,” in *ICML*, 2020, pp. 3515–3523.
- [16] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin, “Attention is all you need,” in *NIPS*, 2017.
- [17] Linguistic Data Consortium, “Csr-ii (wsj1) complete,” in *Linguistic Data Consortium, Philadelphia, vol. LDC94S13A*, 1994.
- [18] John Garofalo, David Graff, Doug Paul, and David Pallett, “Csr-i (wsj0) complete,” in *Linguistic Data Consortium, Philadelphia, vol. LDC93S6A*, 2007.
- [19] Shinji Watanabe, Florian Boyer, Xuankai Chang, Pengcheng Guo, Tomoki Hayashi, Yosuke Higuchi, Takaaki Hori, Wen-Chin Huang, Hirofumi Inaguma, Naoyuki Kamo, Shigeki Karita, Chenda Li, Jing Shi, Aswin Subramanian, and Wangyou Zhang, “The 2020 espnet update: New features, broadened applications, performance improvements, and future plans,” in *IEEE Data Science and Learning Workshop (DSLW)*, 2021.
- [20] Tom Ko, Vijayaditya Peditinti, Daniel Povey, and Sanjeev Khudanpur, “Audio augmentation for speech recognition,” in *INTERSPEECH*, 2015.
- [21] Daniel S. Park, William Chan, Yu Zhang, Chung-Cheng Chiu, Barret Zoph, Ekin D. Cubuk, and Quoc V. Le, “SpecAugment: A simple data augmentation method for automatic speech recognition,” in *INTERSPEECH*, 2019, pp. 2613–2617.