

Joint Learning of Correlated Sequence Labelling Tasks Using Bidirectional Recurrent Neural Networks

Vardaan Pahuja^{1*}, Anirban Laha^{1*}, Shachar Mirkin², Vikas Raykar¹, Lili Kotlerman², Guy Lev²

¹IBM Research - Bangalore, India

²IBM Research - Haifa, Israel

vapahuja@in.ibm.com, anirlaha@in.ibm.com, shacharm@il.ibm.com, viraykar@in.ibm.com,
lili.kotlerman@il.ibm.com, guylev@il.ibm.com

Abstract

The stream of words produced by Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR) systems is devoid of any punctuations and formatting. Most natural language processing applications usually expect segmented and well-formatted texts as input, which is not available in ASR output. This paper proposes a novel technique of jointly modelling multiple correlated tasks such as punctuation and capitalization using bidirectional recurrent neural networks, which leads to improved performance for each of these tasks. This method can be extended for joint modelling of any other correlated multiple sequence labelling tasks.

1. Introduction

Sequence labelling involves the assignment of a categorical label to each element of a sequence of observed values. Some common examples include punctuation prediction for Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR) transcripts, capitalization recovery (i.e. restoring the case of the lowercased words, a.k.a. *true casing*), part-of-speech tagging, named entity recognition etc. In this paper we are interested in the task of *multiple sequence labelling*, where the goal is to assign *multiple categorical labels* to every element of the same sequence (for example, predict both the punctuation and capitalization for a given ASR speech transcript). We specifically address the scenario where the multiple sequence labelling tasks are correlated. Consider the following two examples,

1. ...and it hasn't been refined enough yet, ***It*** needs to worked on until it can speak fluently
2. This young doctor, ***Tom Ferguson***, was the medical editor of the *Whole Earth Catalog*.

The first example shows the co-occurrence of capitalization preceded by PERIOD, whereas in the second example, the two COMMAS are surrounding capitalized proper nouns. Such co-occurrences illustrate the fact the punctuation and capitalization are two correlated tasks that should benefit from each other. We refer to these kind of sequence labelling tasks as *correlated multiple sequence labelling* and propose a novel approach using a bidirectional recurrent neural network (BiRNN) [1] which is trained jointly for prediction across such tasks.

Speeches are often transcribed by ASR systems, that convert the audio signals into a stream of words. Apart from the frequently high word error rate, this stream is also devoid of the standard textual structure present in written texts. Structural aspects [2] include punctuation, capitalization, and numeric data formatting, such as digits, dates and phone numbers. Recovering the structure from raw word transcripts is essential

*Equal contribution by the first two authors.

mainly for two main reasons: firstly, to enhance the readability and understanding of the transcripts [3, 4] and secondly, to enable the subsequent text processing and make it more accurate. Many works have shown the impact of the structure recovery for tasks such as summarization [5, 6], part-of-speech (POS) tagging [7, 8], machine translation [9, 10] and information extraction [11], among others.

In this paper, we attempt to recover two aspects of structure, namely, punctuation and capitalization, by casting them as correlated multiple sequence labelling problems. Earlier work like [12] had proposed the idea of training multiple sequence labelling tasks together with slight improvement for POS and NER when combined with task-specific feature engineering. However, they had assumed the availability of sentence segmentation and capitalization as inputs. The solution we propose does not assume any feature engineering and is suitable for speech transcripts as they do not come with punctuation or capitalization.

Earlier papers like [2, 4, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18] have shown the usefulness of pause duration and prosodic features for punctuation prediction in comparison to using textual features alone. In this work, our goal is to boost the accuracy of punctuation prediction without taking extra inputs like prosodic features by training capitalization task jointly along with punctuation task. This framework is, to the best of our knowledge, the first RNN (BiRNN) based framework for joint training of a sequence labelling task. Moreover, this framework is general enough to be applicable for joint training of other correlated sequence labelling tasks, say POS tagging and named entity recognition.

In a nutshell, our contributions are the following:

- An RNN (BiRNN) based joint learning framework for multiple correlated sequence labelling tasks with no feature engineering.
- Improvement in punctuation prediction on speech transcripts by jointly training with capitalization without using any prosodic features. Similar improvement is also observed in capitalization.
- State-of-the-art performance in benchmark punctuation prediction dataset.

2. Correlated Multiple Sequence Labelling

For the structure recovery of ASR transcripts, punctuation and capitalization are considered highly important. There are various effective approaches to insert punctuations and specifically sentence boundaries into raw speech transcripts [19, 20]. In this work, we consider both punctuation and capitalization together treating it as a *correlated multiple sequence labelling* problem, which is defined below:




Figure 1: Joint Learning of Correlated Sequence Labelling Task

Given a sequence of words $W = (w_1, w_2, w_3, \dots, w_n)$ from a vocabulary V , the task is to predict K labels $\{l_i^1, l_i^2, \dots, l_i^K\}$ corresponding to word w_i , one for each of the K tasks. This will produce K correlated output sequences of the form $O^k = (l_1^k, l_2^k, \dots, l_n^k)$, one for each of the K sequence labelling tasks. Here, labels for different tasks come from different label space, as in $l_i^k \in L^k$.

Following the above definition, $K = 1$ trivially implies a single sequence labelling problem. In our setting, $K = 2$ when we consider punctuation and capitalization tasks together. Typically, three punctuation marks have received most attention in existing literature due to their higher frequency of occurrence: periods, commas and question marks (Q-MARK below). Thus, $L^1 = \{\text{COMMA, PERIOD, Q-MARK, NO-PUNCT}\}$, where there is high class imbalance tilted towards NO-PUNCT class. Here, the label l_i^1 corresponds to the punctuation occurring before the word w_i . In case of capitalization, the label l_i^2 depicts the surface form of word w_i , which can be any of the following: all-lowercase (like ‘hello’), all-uppercase (like ‘UPPER’), mixed-case (like ‘McGill’), sentence-case (only first letter capitalized, like ‘London’) and single-letter-word-case (like ‘I’).

Given a sequence of n input vectors $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$ and an initial state vector \mathbf{s}_0 , an RNN generates a sequence of n state vectors $\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_n$ alongside a sequence of n output vectors $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n$; that is, $RNN(\mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n) = \mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_n, \mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n$. The input vectors \mathbf{x}_i are the latent embeddings for each word w_i in the sequence and \mathbf{s}_i represents the state of the RNN after observing the inputs $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_i$. The output vector \mathbf{y}_i is a function of the corresponding state vector \mathbf{s}_i and is then used for further prediction. An RNN is defined by the following update equations: $\mathbf{s}_i = R(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{s}_{i-1})$ and $\mathbf{y}_i = O(\mathbf{s}_i)$. Different instantiations of R and O will result in different network structures (Simple RNN, LSTM [21], GRU [22], etc.).

A bidirectional RNN consists of two parallel RNNs, one running forward and another running backward, being able to capture context in both directions (as the words to the right have significant influence on a word label in addition to the words to its left). In other words, the same sequence of input vectors $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$ is fed to both RNNs to produce the sequence of state vectors $\vec{\mathbf{s}}_1, \dots, \vec{\mathbf{s}}_n$ from the forward RNN and $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{s}}_1, \dots, \overleftarrow{\mathbf{s}}_n$ from the backward RNN. Here we extend the bidirectional RNN to model multiple correlated sequence labelling tasks together. For k -th task being considered, the output sequence is denoted by

$\mathbf{y}_1^k, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n^k$, can also be derived from the sequence of state vectors $\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_n$, where $\mathbf{s}_i = [\vec{\mathbf{s}}_i, \overleftarrow{\mathbf{s}}_i]$ through different non-linear functions $O^k = L^k(f(\cdot))$ as defined below:

$$\mathbf{h}_i = f(\mathbf{s}_i) = \phi(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{s}_i + \mathbf{b}) \quad (1)$$

$$\mathbf{m}_i^k = L^k(\mathbf{h}_i) = \mathbf{W}^k\mathbf{h}_i + \mathbf{b}^k \quad (2)$$

$$\mathbf{y}_i^k = \text{softmax}(\mathbf{m}_i^k) \quad (3)$$

In the above formulation, the concatenated state vector \mathbf{s}_i is transformed linearly and passed through the function $\phi \in \{\text{sigmoid, tanh, relu, linear}\}$ to produce a hidden layer vector \mathbf{h}_i . To produce outputs for the different correlated tasks in question, the vector \mathbf{h}_i is then passed through different branches of $\text{linear} + \text{softmax}$, one branch for each of the tasks. That is, for k -th task, the output \mathbf{y}_i^k , is produced from the k -th branch, which leads to the prediction of label l_i^k . The set of trainable parameters are $\{\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{b}, \{\mathbf{W}^k, \mathbf{b}^k\}\}$ in addition to the parameters defining the forward and backward RNNs. Figure 1 illustrates this idea. Architectural variants of RNN, namely, LSTM and GRU, along with multiple layers with the addition of dropout have also been incorporated.

Joint Training Loss Function: The network formulated above is defined on multiple correlated tasks (say K tasks) and is capable of producing K sequences of outputs of the form $\mathbf{y}_1^k, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n^k$. While predicting the outputs for the different tasks, all the trainable parameters required until the computation of \mathbf{h}_i are shared across all tasks and are trained jointly based on the loss function defined over the outputs of all K tasks. The loss \mathcal{L}^k for every task is computed with the standard cross-entropy loss function and then based on predefined weights q_k (over tasks), a weighted average of task-specific losses is taken to produce the final loss \mathcal{L} to be optimized:

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{k=1}^K q_k \mathcal{L}^k \quad (4)$$

This accumulated loss helps the network predict well across all tasks, and if the tasks are correlated (as in our case), then each task should help the other tasks through the joint learning of shared parameters. These shared parameters help produce correlated representations \mathbf{h}_i , which can be used to generate predictions for all tasks.

3. Experiments

To corroborate the hypothesis that the proposed jointly trained model helps improving performance over the individual tasks, we experiment over two different datasets, as described below. All our models are evaluated based on precision, recall and F_1 score, for each punctuation class and overall for all classes, as well as with Slot Error Rate (SER) [23].¹

3.1. Datasets

Intelligence Squared: This dataset was obtained from the Intelligence Squared (IQ2 henceforth) debating television show, whose transcripts are publicly available.² We used 45 debates, each containing talks by four speakers, from which we created a train-validation-test split in a ratio of 60:10:30.³

¹SER is the ratio of the total number of slot errors (substitutions, deletions, and insertions) in the predicted set of labels, to the total number of slots in the gold set of labels.

²<http://www.intelligencesquaredus.org/>

³Evaluation on references only as ASR not available.

IWSLT TED Talks: We use the English transcripts of the English-to-French machine translation task in IWSLT 2012⁴ as our training data with the same train-validation splits as suggested in [24]. We report our test results on two datasets⁵: the first one, used by [25] (henceforth referred to as test-set-1), is the development data of IWSLT 2011 ASR and SLT tasks⁶; the second test set (henceforth referred to as test-set-2) consists of test-dataset-2 of IWSLT 2011 ASR and SLT tasks as used by [24] and T-BRNN [26].

3.2. Experimental Setup

Data Preprocessing: Each train sequence consists of a random number of tokens (40 to 70 in our experiments), with the constraint that it must begin with a new sentence. The unfinished sentence forms the beginning of next train sequence. This scheme of generating training sequences prevents the model from always learning to predict a period (or a question mark) at the end of every sequence. For the validation and test datasets, we use a single consolidated sequence comprising of all the sentences, to simulate a real ASR stream. This is not done for the training dataset to avoid memory issues with extremely long sequences. For evaluating our model on ASR transcripts, the punctuations and casing from the reference transcripts are mapped to the ASR transcripts, based on Levenshtein alignment, as discussed in [13]. Since the mapping process is sensitive to ASR word errors, we adopt the approach in [25], where evaluation is restricted to only those punctuations for which the left and right context words have been recognized correctly by ASR. Similarly for capitalization, restriction is to words matching those in the reference. For punctuation, we use the standard four classes as mentioned in section 2, whereas for capitalization, sentence-case and mixed-case are merged as the latter occurs very rarely and has similar influence as the former.

Network Training and Tuning: Our model architecture is trained by standard backpropagation in TensorFlow [27]. In our experiments, we trained two kinds of models: joint model (or Corr-BiRNN) which is trained jointly on punctuation and capitalization tasks, and task-specific models (or Single-BiRNN) that were trained separately for each of the two tasks. Extensive hyper-parameter tuning was done for the joint model as well as the separate task-specific models for both IQ2 and TED datasets. The tuned hyper-parameters include the number of layers and the number of hidden units per layer in the BiRNN, RNN dropout rate, RNN output dropout rate, type of RNN (Simple RNN, LSTM or GRU), the number of units in outer hidden layer, hidden layer activation function, task-specific loss weights and batch size. The best hyper-parameter setting for the joint model as well as the task-specific models was selected based on SER performance on the validation set for the task at hand. The selected settings are then evaluated on the reference transcripts of the corresponding test datasets and also on test ASR (available for TED only) on the respective tasks. Please note best hyper-parameter setting for a punctuation task-specific model may not be the same as that of a capitalization task-specific model. In other words, Single-BiRNN may have different settings chosen based on the task at hand. Similarly, for Corr-BiRNN, different settings give best validation SER performance on punctuation and capitalization tasks.

⁴<https://wit3.fbk.eu/mt.php?release=2012-03>

⁵Both Reference and ASR available.

⁶http://iwslt2011.org/doku.php?id=06_evaluation

4. Results and Discussion

The test evaluations are reported in Tables 1-3. For all tables, each row contains test evaluation metrics for the hyper-parameter setting selected based on validation SER performance of the task being considered. Also Table 4 shows example outputs of our models on ASR compared to gold labels, created by mapping from reference.

For IQ2 dataset (refer Table 1), joint training results in improved performance on both of the tasks, in comparison to models trained for each of the individual tasks. This is consistent based on both overall F_1 -score as well as SER metrics.

In case of TED capitalization task (as in Table 3), the Corr-BiRNN model outperforms Single-BiRNN model performance in terms of F_1 score for all test datasets (including test-set-1 and test-set-2, though being shown only for test-set-2 for interest of space), across both Reference and ASR transcripts. However, improvement is not seen in UPPERCASE performance, which is justified as this label is not correlated with any punctuation.

Regarding the TED punctuation task (details in Table 2), the the Corr-BiRNN model outperforms Single-BiRNN model performance (F_1 score) for punctuation task in case of test-set-1 (Ref.), test-set-1 (ASR) and test-set-2 (Ref.), that is, in three out of four cases. In the case of test-set-2 (ASR), the Single-BiRNN model is only marginally better than the Corr-BiRNN model. This can be attributed to the fact that the Single-BiRNN model was chosen based on the validation performance on TED reference transcripts, which are quite different from ASR transcripts it is evaluated on.

While comparing to the existing benchmarks on the TED punctuation task (refer Table 2), our Corr-BiRNN model fares significantly better on all fronts (especially Q-MARK with 22.9% gain in F_1 score) compared to existing benchmark [25] for test-set-1 (Ref.). It also outperforms the T-BRNN [26] benchmark in terms of COMMA and PERIOD for test-set-2 (Ref.), which are the more frequent punctuations, in addition to overall, measured in F_1 score. In ASR though, we do not see improvement, mainly because validation dataset is based on reference transcripts.

Despite having a much simpler model, we are able to beat the benchmark performance by T-BRNN [26](a more complex attention-based BiRNN model) in many cases. This substantiates our claim that joint learning helps learning better representations than task-specific training for a particular task. Our simpler model has the added value of learning and predicting much faster than T-BRNN. In addition, our predictions are generated in one shot over the whole consolidated test sequence and does not need to follow window based prediction as in T-BRNN.

5. Related Work

Simplest approaches for single sequence labelling that have been tried out are the unigram language model[8] and n -gram language model[28]. These models see limited fixed context around a word which may not be sufficient for prediction and they also face data sparsity issues as n increases. There are also classical approaches like Hidden Markov Models (HMM), maximum-entropy models (Max-Ent) and conditional random fields (CRF), all of which try to model a hidden state sequence corresponding to the observed word sequence as in [19, 29, 25, 30, 15, 17, 2]. However, these models are more difficult to train and construction of hand-crafted features is non-trivial. Models built using DNNs [12, 24] usually consist of a context window around the word being considered, which is fed

Ref.	Task	Model	Class Labels												
			COMMA			PERIOD			Q-MARK			OVERALL			
			Pr.	Re.	F ₁	Pr.	Re.	F ₁	Pr.	Re.	F ₁	Pr.	Re.	F ₁	SER
	Punctuation	Single-BiRNN	43.7	54.9	48.7	73.9	19.3	30.6	52.3	23.7	32.6	48.0	39.0	43.0	77.6
		Corr-BiRNN	57.9	34.3	43.1	62.0	53.3	57.3	45.8	25.7	32.9	59.7	42.0	49.3	68.9
Ref.	Capitalization	Model	UPPERCASE			SENTENCE - CASE			SINGLE-CASE			OVERALL			
			Pr.	Re.	F ₁	Pr.	Re.	F ₁	Pr.	Re.	F ₁	Pr.	Re.	F ₁	SER
				Single-BiRNN	96.5	63.2	76.4	87.0	55.7	67.9	99.9	98.2	99.0	89.6	61.5
	Corr-BiRNN	95.1	63.2	76.0	80.9	65.3	72.3	99.7	98.0	98.9	84.2	69.5	76.2	43.0	

Table 1: IQ2 results

Ref.	Model	COMMA			PERIOD			Q-MARK			OVERALL			
		Pr.	Re.	F ₁	Pr.	Re.	F ₁	Pr.	Re.	F ₁	Pr.	Re.	F ₁	SER
Ref.	Ueffing et al. [25]	(45.0)	(47.0)	(46.0)	(54.0)	(72.0)	(62.0)	(53.0)	(33.0)	(41.0)	(47.8)	(54.8)	(51.0)	-
	T-BRNN [26]	64.4	45.2	53.1	72.3	71.5	71.9	67.5	58.7	62.9	68.9	58.1	63.1	51.3
	T-BRNN-pre [26]	65.5	47.1	54.8	73.3	72.5	72.9	70.7	63.0	66.7	70.0	59.7	64.4	49.7
	Single-BiRNN	62.2	47.7	54.0	74.6	72.1	73.4	67.5	52.9	59.3	69.2	59.8	64.2	51.1
	Corr-BiRNN	(58.1)	(41.4)	(48.4)	(72.2)	(72.0)	(72.1)	(76.9)	(59.5)	(67.1)	(66.1)	(55.5)	(60.3)	(58.1)
	Single-BiRNN	60.9	52.4	56.4	75.3	70.8	73.0	70.7	56.9	63.0	68.6	61.6	64.9	50.8
	Corr-BiRNN	(55.6)	(44.5)	(49.4)	(72.5)	(72.2)	(72.4)	(74.6)	(56.0)	(63.9)	(64.5)	(57.1)	(60.6)	(59.2)
ASR	Ueffing et al. [25]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	T-BRNN [26]	60.0	45.1	51.5	69.7	69.2	69.4	61.5	45.7	52.5	65.5	57.0	60.9	57.8
	T-BRNN-pre [26]	59.6	42.9	49.9	70.7	72.0	71.4	60.7	48.6	54.0	66.0	57.3	61.4	57.0
	Single-BiRNN	55.9	48.7	52.0	63.1	70.9	66.8	66.7	50.0	57.1	60.1	59.6	59.8	64.1
	Corr-BiRNN	(45.7)	(35.6)	(40.0)	(60.2)	(67.4)	(63.6)	(56.4)	(53.7)	(55.0)	(53.7)	(50.1)	(51.8)	(76.0)
	Single-BiRNN	53.5	52.5	53.0	63.7	68.7	66.2	66.7	50.0	57.1	59.0	60.3	59.7	65.4
	Corr-BiRNN	(44.9)	(40.6)	(42.6)	(61.4)	(64.8)	(63.1)	(56.1)	(56.1)	(56.1)	(53.2)	(51.7)	(52.4)	(75.7)

Table 2: TED punctuation results. The figures mentioned in parenthesis refer to test-set-1.

Ref.	Model	UPPERCASE			SENTENCE-CASE			SINGLE-CASE			OVERALL			
		Pr.	Re.	F ₁	Pr.	Re.	F ₁	Pr.	Re.	F ₁	Pr.	Re.	F ₁	SER
Ref.	Single-BiRNN	94.1	64.0	76.2	84.4	68.2	75.4	100.0	98.9	99.4	88.8	75.3	81.5	33.8
	Corr-BiRNN	93.7	60.0	73.2	82.6	71.9	76.9	99.4	99.7	99.6	87.2	78.2	82.4	33.0
ASR	Single-BiRNN	87.5	87.5	87.5	80.4	58.6	67.8	100.0	99.1	99.5	86.7	69.2	76.9	41.3
	Corr-BiRNN	87.5	87.5	87.5	76.3	62.2	68.6	99.4	100.0	99.7	83.3	72.1	77.3	42.3

Table 3: TED capitalization results

ASR	Model	Punctuation	Capitalization
		<i>Gold</i>	in the nineteen eighties this young doctor , tom ferguson , was the medical editor of the whole earth catalog
	<i>Single-BiRNN</i>	in the nineteen eighties . this young doctor , tom ferguson was the medical editor of the whole earth catalog	we 're watching a documentary and my dad is the most voracious reader I know
	<i>Corr-BiRNN</i>	in the nineteen eighties this young doctor , tom ferguson , was the medical editor of the whole earth catalog	we 're watching a documentary And my dad is the most voracious reader I know

Table 4: Examples of Joint vs. Individual model predictions on TED ASR dataset

to a multi-layer perceptron that extracts different abstractions of features relevant to the sequence-labelling task. More recent approaches [4, 29, 26] considered RNNs, especially LSTMs and reported good results. Compared to the fixed window-based approaches, Recurrent Neural Networks (RNN) work on the full sequence of words and dynamically adapt their internal representations accordingly. These papers have shown deep learning based solutions outperforming the classical approaches.

Multiple sequence labeling tasks and their inter-dependence has been studied in great detail [12]. However, for tasks like POS tagging, NER and chunking, they assumed the availability of punctuation and capitalization, which is not true for ASR transcripts. More recently, joint prediction of punctuation and capitalization for transcribed speech has been attempted in [28], albeit using n -gram language models. In [31], a joint label space for punctuation and capitalization tasks is created, in order to predict labels for both tasks. This is, however, not scalable since label space can possibly explode with the introduction of more labels for each task. A few other works related to

joint sequence labelling include joint parsing and punctuation prediction[32] using a CRF-based model, and disfluency detection alongside other NLP tasks like punctuation prediction [17] and dependency parsing [33], using classical solutions.

In our work, we explore the joint learning of correlated multiple sequence labelling tasks like punctuation and capitalization using deep-learning based approach without any feature engineering being involved.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we have shown the utility of models jointly trained on two common ASR related tasks, namely, punctuation and capitalization, to learn better representations for either of them. Our simple jointly-trained BiRNN model, trained only on lexical features, outperforms several complex models, which demonstrates its robustness and generalization ability. Future work will involve joint training of a variety of NLP tasks to generalize better across NLP tasks.

7. References

- [1] M. Schuster and K. Paliwal, "Bidirectional recurrent neural networks," *Trans. Sig. Proc.*, vol. 45, no. 11, pp. 2673–2681, Nov. 1997.
- [2] Y. Liu, E. Shriberg, A. Stolcke, D. Hillard, M. Ostendorf, and M. Harper, "Enriching speech recognition with automatic detection of sentence boundaries and disfluencies," *Audio, Speech, and Language Processing, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 1526–1540, 2006.
- [3] M. Shugrina, "Formatting time-aligned asr transcripts for readability," in *Human Language Technologies: The 2010 Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, ser. HLT '10. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2010, pp. 198–206.
- [4] O. Tilk and T. Alummäe, "Lstm for punctuation restoration in speech transcripts," in *Sixteenth Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association*, 2015.
- [5] Y. Liu and S. Xie, "Impact of automatic sentence segmentation on meeting summarization," in *Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, 2008. ICASSP 2008. IEEE International Conference on*. IEEE, 2008, pp. 5009–5012.
- [6] J. Mrozinski, E. W. Whittaker, P. Chatain, and S. Furui, "Automatic sentence segmentation of speech for automatic summarization," in *Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, 2006. ICASSP 2006 Proceedings. 2006 IEEE International Conference on*, vol. 1. IEEE, 2006, pp. I–I.
- [7] D. Hillard, Z. Huang, H. Ji, R. Grishman, D. Hakkani-Tur, M. Harper, M. Ostendorf, and W. Wang, "Impact of automatic comma prediction on pos/name tagging of speech," in *2006 IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop*. IEEE, 2006, pp. 58–61.
- [8] L. V. Lita, A. Ittycheriah, S. Roukos, and N. Kambhatla, "Truecasing," in *Proceedings of the 41st Annual Meeting on Association for Computational Linguistics-Volume 1*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2003, pp. 152–159.
- [9] M. Paulik, S. Rao, I. Lane, S. Vogel, and T. Schultz, "Sentence segmentation and punctuation recovery for spoken language translation," in *Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, 2008. ICASSP 2008. IEEE International Conference on*. IEEE, 2008, pp. 5105–5108.
- [10] E. Matusov, A. Mauser, and H. Ney, "Automatic sentence segmentation and punctuation prediction for spoken language translation," in *IWSLT*, 2006, pp. 158–165.
- [11] B. Favre, R. Grishman, D. Hillard, H. Ji, D. Hakkani-Tür, and M. Ostendorf, "Punctuating speech for information extraction," in *Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, 2008. ICASSP 2008. IEEE International Conference on*. IEEE, 2008, pp. 5013–5016.
- [12] R. Collobert, J. Weston, L. Bottou, M. Karlen, K. Kavukcuoglu, and P. Kuksa, "Natural language processing (almost) from scratch," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 12, no. Aug, pp. 2493–2537, 2011.
- [13] J. Kolár and L. Lamel, "Development and evaluation of automatic punctuation for french and english speech-to-text," in *INTERSPEECH*, 2012, pp. 1376–1379.
- [14] J.-H. Kim and P. C. Woodland, "The use of prosody in a combined system for punctuation generation and speech recognition," in *INTERSPEECH*, 2001, pp. 2757–2760.
- [15] J. Huang and G. Zweig, "Maximum entropy model for punctuation annotation from speech," in *INTERSPEECH*, 2002.
- [16] T. Levy, V. Silber-Varod, and A. Moyal, "The effect of pitch, intensity and pause duration in punctuation detection," in *Electrical & Electronics Engineers in Israel (IEEEI), 2012 IEEE 27th Convention of*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 1–4.
- [17] D. Baron, E. Shriberg, and A. Stolcke, "Automatic punctuation and disfluency detection in multi-party meetings using prosodic and lexical cues," *Channels*, vol. 20, no. 61, p. 41, 2002.
- [18] V. Eidelman, Z. Huang, and M. Harper, "Lessons learned in part-of-speech tagging of conversational speech," in *Proceedings of the 2010 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, ser. EMNLP '10. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2010, pp. 821–831.
- [19] X. Wang, H. T. Ng, and K. C. Sim, "Dynamic conditional random fields for joint sentence boundary and punctuation prediction," in *INTERSPEECH*, 2012, pp. 1384–1387.
- [20] C. Xu, L. Xie, G. Huang, X. Xiao, E. Chng, and H. Li, "A deep neural network approach for sentence boundary detection in broadcast news," in *INTERSPEECH*, 2014, pp. 2887–2891.
- [21] S. Hochreiter and J. Schmidhuber, "Long short-term memory," *Neural Comput.*, vol. 9, no. 8, pp. 1735–1780, Nov. 1997.
- [22] K. Cho, B. van Merriënboer, Ç. Gülçehre, D. Bahdanau, F. Bougares, H. Schwenk, and Y. Bengio, "Learning phrase representations using RNN encoder-decoder for statistical machine translation," in *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2014*, 2014, pp. 1724–1734.
- [23] J. Makhoul, F. Kubala, R. Schwartz, R. Weischedel *et al.*, "Performance measures for information extraction," in *Proceedings of DARPA broadcast news workshop*, 1999, pp. 249–252.
- [24] X. Che, C. Wang, H. Yang, and C. Meinel, "Punctuation prediction for unsegmented transcript based on word vector," in *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2016)*. European Language Resources Association (ELRA), May 2016.
- [25] N. Ueffing, M. Bisani, and P. Vozila, "Improved models for automatic punctuation prediction for spoken and written text," in *INTERSPEECH*, F. Bimbot, C. Cerisara, C. Fougerson, G. Gravier, L. Lamel, F. Pellegrino, and P. Perrier, Eds. ISCA, 2013, pp. 3097–3101.
- [26] O. Tilk and T. Alummäe, "Bidirectional recurrent neural network with attention mechanism for punctuation restoration," *Inter-speech 2016*, pp. 3047–3051, 2016.
- [27] M. Abadi, P. Barham, J. Chen, Z. Chen, A. Davis, J. Dean, M. Devin, S. Ghemawat, G. Irving, M. Isard *et al.*, "Tensorflow: A system for large-scale machine learning," in *Proceedings of the 12th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI)*. Savannah, Georgia, USA, 2016.
- [28] A. Gravano, M. Jansche, and M. Bacchiani, "Restoring punctuation and capitalization in transcribed speech," in *2009 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*. IEEE, 2009, pp. 4741–4744.
- [29] X. Ma and E. Hovy, "End-to-end sequence labeling via bidirectional lstm-cnns-crf," in *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, August 2016, pp. 1064–1074.
- [30] W. Lu and H. T. Ng, "Better punctuation prediction with dynamic conditional random fields," in *Proceedings of the 2010 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2010, pp. 177–186.
- [31] T. Baldwin and M. P. A. K. Joseph, "Restoring punctuation and casing in english text," in *Australasian Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. Springer, 2009, pp. 547–556.
- [32] D. Zhang, S. Wu, N. Yang, and M. Li, "Punctuation prediction with transition-based parsing," in *ACL (1)*, 2013, pp. 752–760.
- [33] M. Honnibal and M. Johnson, "Joint incremental disfluency detection and dependency parsing," *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, vol. 2, pp. 131–142, 2014.