

---

# Framework for Curating Speech Datasets and Evaluating ASR Systems: A Case Study for Polish

---

**Michał Junczyk**

Department of Artificial Intelligence  
Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań  
ul. Uniwersytetu Poznańskiego 4  
61-614 Poznań, Poland  
micjun@amu.edu.pl

## Abstract

Speech datasets available in the public domain are often underutilized because of challenges in discoverability and interoperability. A comprehensive framework has been designed to survey, catalog, and curate available speech datasets, which allows replicable evaluation of automatic speech recognition (ASR) systems. A case study focused on the Polish language was conducted; the framework was applied to curate more than 24 datasets and evaluate 25 combinations of ASR systems and models. This research constitutes the most extensive comparison to date of both commercial and free ASR systems for the Polish language. It draws insights from 600 system-model-test set evaluations, marking a significant advancement in both scale and comprehensiveness. The results of surveys and performance comparisons are available as interactive dashboards,<sup>1</sup> along with curated datasets<sup>2,3</sup> and the open challenge call.<sup>4</sup> Tools used for evaluation are open-sourced,<sup>5</sup> facilitating replication and adaptation for other languages, as well as continuous expansion with new datasets and systems.

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Background

The Polish language is spoken by more than 50 million people worldwide. The number of available ASR systems and services, as well as speech data resources that support Polish, is systematically growing. However, the community lacks the resources to methodically evaluate and track progress. First, the available data assets are underutilized due to challenges such as discoverability, licensing, and interoperability. Secondly, there is no standardized ASR benchmark dataset for Poland. These issues hinder the development of new systems and applications, as reliable benchmarks and leaderboards are crucial to drive research progress and assess the suitability of ASR technologies for specific scenarios Nathan Lambert (2023). The international ASR community has recognized the need for standardized evaluation methodologies to ensure consistent and comparative performance assessments in ASR Aksénova *et al.* (2021); Szymański *et al.* (2020); Gandhi *et al.* (2022) and the ML field in general Liao *et al.* (2021); Olson *et al.* (2017); Northcutt *et al.* (2021). This calls for innovations in the management of ASR data sets and evaluation frameworks. Koo *et al.* (2023)

---

<sup>1</sup>AMU ASR Leaderboard

<sup>2</sup>AMU BIGOS dataset

<sup>3</sup>PELCRA for BIGOS dataset

<sup>4</sup>Polish ASR challenge

<sup>5</sup>AMU BIGOS Eval Tools

## 1.2 Research gap

Existing data curation and ASR benchmarking methods for low-resource languages such as Polish exhibit several shortcomings:

- **Data utilization:** Speech datasets are underutilized due to limited awareness or accessibility.
- **Data quality:** A lack of proper understanding of test sets can result in misrepresentation of current state-of-the-art performance.
- **Evaluation reproducibility:** Limited adoption of benchmark sets hinders the validation of the research results.
- **Evaluation scope:** Ecologically valid evaluation of a specific ASR application requires considering a larger number of datasets, systems, and performance metrics.

## 1.3 Contributions

1. **Curation of benchmark dataset:** A benchmark dataset was created from 24 openly available datasets to address the lack of standardized evaluation resources for Polish ASR systems. It includes robust samples from various sources of read and spontaneous speech. The dataset is openly available and actively maintained to enable systematic and comprehensive analysis.
2. **Development of a benchmark framework:** The framework supports various datasets, systems, and metrics, ensuring consistent ASR evaluation with standardized protocols.
3. **Evaluation of ASR systems:** Using a curated dataset, 10 ASR systems and 25 models, both commercial and open-source, were compared. Significant variations across different systems, datasets, and speaker demographics were discovered.
4. **Open sharing of resources:** All datasets, tools, and evaluation results have been made openly available to the research community. This promotes transparency, reproducibility, and collaboration, enabling other researchers to build upon the work, either by developing ASR systems for Polish based on evaluation results or applying the framework to other languages.

# 2 Methodology

## 2.1 Framework overview

The devised framework for data curation and ASR benchmarking encompasses three main processes:

1. **ASR speech datasets survey**
2. **Curation of ASR benchmark dataset**
3. **Evaluation of ASR systems**

Figure 1 illustrates the framework architecture and the core open tools used for development. The subsequent sections provide a detailed description of the specific processes and tools.

## 2.2 Survey of datasets

A keyword-based literature review Rowley & Slack (2004) was used to identify and document relevant datasets. The datasets were manually analyzed and annotated. The final methodology included:

1. Conducting keyword searches in relevant sources
2. Manually analyzing and annotating documentation
3. Cross-checking multiple sources for consistency and accuracy
4. Validating and analyzing downloadable datasets
5. Analyzing metadata to derive insights on Polish ASR speech datasets
6. Making the catalog and insights publicly available




Figure 1: Architecture of data curation and ASR evaluation framework.

The survey sources include language data repositories, scientific community platforms, and public domain documentation. The attributes considered include creator, funding, license, publication date, quality assurance, and content characteristics such as the format of the audio file and the number of speakers Junczyk (2024). Resulting catalog and survey insights are shared on GitHub<sup>6</sup> and Hugging Face.<sup>7</sup>

## 2.3 Dataset curation

### 2.3.1 Design considerations

A curated benchmark dataset for Polish ASR systems is intended to have the following features:

- **Task-appropriate:** Relevant and practical for the intended ASR task.
- **Accessible:** Available online under a license that allows the free use and creation of derivative works.
- **Discoverable:** Easy to find and acquire (without time-consuming registration or other access barriers).
- **Diverse and challenging:** Containing various examples to test the adaptability of the model, as well as complex cases to encourage community participation and minimize the risk of benchmark saturation.
- **Annotated:** With metadata about speakers and recordings allowing nuanced analysis and interpretation of the results.
- **Optimally sized:** Large enough to be representative, but manageable to download and explore.
- **Clean yet realistic:** Free of major errors, but noisy enough to represent the complexity of the real world.
- **Well-documented:** Provided with documentation that is understandable to users without technical skills.
- **Well-explained:** Provided with evaluation baselines and how-to-use script examples.

### 2.3.2 Leveraging speech data catalog for sourcing open data sets

The Polish ASR speech dataset catalog Junczyk (2023) was used to select datasets for curation based on following criteria:

<sup>6</sup>Polish ASR speech data survey – GitHub

<sup>7</sup>Polish ASR survey – Hugging Face

- Datasets are available online under a license allowing free use for non-commercial purposes.
- Transcriptions are aligned with the recordings.
- Recording sampling rate is at least 8 kHz.
- Audio files are encoded using at least 16 bits per sample.

24 datasets were selected for curation as *BIGOS*<sup>8</sup> (*Benchmark Intended Grouping of Open Speech*) benchmark dataset:

- **The Common Voice data set** (*mozilla-common\_voice\_15-23*) is a multilingual resource Ardila *et al.* (2019a) covering over 60 languages and many underrepresented groups. Available under CC-0 license.
- **The Multilingual LibriSpeech (MLS) data set** (*fair-mls-20*) is a large multilingual corpus made by Facebook AI Research (FAIR) Pratap *et al.* (2020). Derived from audiobooks, it covers eight languages, with 44,000 hours of English and 6,000 hours for other languages. The Polish data includes 137 hours from 25 books by 16 speakers. Available under CC-BY license.
- **The Clarin Studio data set** (*clarin-pjatk-studio-15*) by CLARIN-PL includes 13,802 short utterances (56 hours) from 554 sessions by 317 speakers. Each session has 20-31 audio files, all recorded in a studio for clear audio. Available under CC-BY-SA license.
- **The Clarin Mobile data set** (*clarin-pjatk-mobile-15*) is a Polish speech corpus of read speech recorded on a telephone. It includes many speakers reading several dozen sentences and words with rare phonemes. Available under CC-BY-SA license.
- **The Jerzy Sas PWR data sets** (Politechnika Wroclawska) comprise three legacy sets of recordings available in the public domain:
  - Male speaker speech set (*pwr-maleset-unk*) – single male speaker recordings.
  - Utterances containing short words (*pwr-shortwords-unk*) – single-phoneme conjunctions and prepositions likely to be misrecognized.
  - Spoken commands as very important utterances (VIUs) (*pwr-viu-unk*) – editor control commands and domain-specific utterances.
- **The M-AI Labs Speech corpus** (*mailabs-19*) created from audiobooks as *MLS*. Intended for training speech recognition and synthesis systems in nine languages, with nearly a thousand hours of audio, including 53.5 hours for Polish. Available under proprietary license.
- **The AZON Read and Spontaneous Speech data sets** (*pwr-azon\_spont-20*, *pwr-azon\_read-20*) contain recordings from academic staff in the physical chemistry domain, including both supervised readings and unsupervised spontaneous recordings such as interviews and presentations. Available under a CC-BY-SA license.<sup>9</sup>
- **Google FLEURS** (*google-fleurs-22*) is a parallel speech benchmark data set in 102 languages, based on the FLoRes-101 machine translation benchmark Conneau *et al.* (2022). Hosted on Hugging Face<sup>10</sup> and available under a CC-BY license.
- **PolyAI Minds14** (*polyai-minds14-21*) is a dataset for training and evaluating intent recognition systems using spoken data. Covers spoken samples in the commercial e-banking domain in 14 language variations Gerz *et al.* (2021). Hosted on Hugging Face<sup>11</sup> and available under a CC-BY license.
- **PolEval 22 Diabiz sample** (*ul-diabiz\_poleval-22*) was used for a punctuation restoration task in the 2022 PolEval competition. It is a subset of the *DiaBiz homepage*<sup>12</sup> dialog corpus of phone-based customer-agent interactions by the PELCRA group of the University of Łódź. Available publicly under CC-BY-SA-NC-ND and curated with the consent of the author.

<sup>8</sup>The Polish word *bigos* is the name of a cabbage-based stew.

<sup>9</sup>AZON dataset homepage

<sup>10</sup>FLEURS dataset homepage

<sup>11</sup>Minds14 dataset homepage

<sup>12</sup>Diabiz

- **SpokesMix**<sup>13</sup> is a corpus of conversational Polish by the PELCRA group Pezik (2018). It includes speech recordings and word-by-word transcriptions with non-speech events. Available under the CC-BY-NC-ND license and curated for ASR benchmarking purposes with permission of the author.
- **SpokesBiz**<sup>14</sup> is a corpus of conversational Polish from the CLARIN-BIZ project, featuring over 650 hours of recordings from nearly 600 speakers Pezik *et al.* (2023). Transcriptions are diarized and manually annotated. Includes eight diverse subsets, e.g. biographical interviews, job interviews, podcasts, and student presentations. Available under the CC-BY-NC-ND license and curated for ASR benchmarking purposes with the author’s permission.

Datasheets describing the content of curated datasets can be found in Appendices B.6, B.4, B.3 and B.5, as well as Hugging Face.<sup>15</sup>

### 2.3.3 Curation process

#### 1. Dataset structure curation:

- Downloading and manually inspecting format and contents
- Creating train/dev/test splits if not available
- Assigning standard IDs to speakers and files

#### 2. Audio file curation:

- Removal of invalid audio files
- Unifying audio format to WAV 16 bits/16 kHz
- Normalizing audio amplitude to -3 dBFS
- Splitting long audio files into shorter segments based on time-alignment annotations

#### 3. Text files (transcripts and metadata) curation:

- Converting text encoding to UTF8
- Extracting original transcription and removing redundant characters
- Extracting and unifying metadata contents
- Generating metadata from text and audio content
- Saving in the standard tabular format

#### 4. Dataset distribution

- Uploading to the HF dataset hub
- Referencing the original license in the README file

The resulting *BIGOS utterance data object* with a description of the standard metadata fields is available in Table 7 in the Appendix.

## 2.4 ASR evaluation

### 2.4.1 System design considerations

Established tools and platforms were used where possible. Table 1 provides an overview of the main design considerations.

### 2.4.2 Overview of the evaluation process

In total 25 models of 7 ASR systems were evaluated: Google STT, Azure STT, Whisper, AssemblyAI, NeMo, MMS and Wav2Vec. The complete list is presented in Table 17. Currently, 5 evaluation metrics are supported: SER, WER, MER, WIL, and CER Morris *et al.* (2004). The methods for normalizing references and hypotheses are listed in Appendix 19. Python scripts used for the evaluation are available on GitHub.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>13</sup>SpokesMix dataset homepage

<sup>14</sup>SpokesBiz dataset homepage

<sup>15</sup>AMU BIGOS Dataset Dashboard

<sup>16</sup>BIGOS ASR evaluation tools

Table 1: Design considerations for ASR evaluation system.

Aspect	Considerations
Metrics	Support for well-established metrics.
Extensibility	Straightforward integration of new datasets, normalization methods, metrics and new ASR systems.
Availability	Publicly accessible and intuitive presentation of results.
Comprehensiveness	Performance analysis across scenarios, system params and user groups.




Figure 2: ASR evaluation process data flow

### 3 Evaluation results

The developed framework supports the following evaluation scenarios. The results of selected scenarios are analyzed in the subsequent sections. Additional results are available in Appendix B.9. All and more detailed results can be accessed through the public dashboard.<sup>17</sup> Dashboard users can display the evaluation results for a specific scenario and choose between various datasets, systems, metrics, normalization techniques, and diagram types.

#### 3.1 Impact of normalization on error rates

Table 3 shows the specific and average reduction of error rates in percentage points depending on the applied normalization method.

<sup>17</sup>AMU Polish ASR Leaderboard

Table 2: Evaluation scenarios and their corresponding analysis dimensions and metrics

Scenario codename	Analysis dimensions of accuracy
Per Systems	Specific system–model variants across all dataset subsets.
Per Subset	System–model variants across specific subsets of test data.
Per System Type	Free and commercial systems, including best and worse performing ones.
Per Model Size	System–model variants with known model sizes.
Per Audio Duration	Best performing systems across audio duration ranges.
Per Speaking Rate	Best performing systems across speech rate ranges.
Per Speaker Age Group	System–model variants across test data with age info.
Per Speaker Gender	System–model variants across test data with gender info.

Table 3: Reduction of error rates caused by normalization of references and hypothesis for BIGOS dataset.

Method	SER [p.p.]	WER [p.p.]	MER [p.p.]	CER [p.p.]	Average [p.p.]
blanks	-1.53	0	0	-0.85	-0.6
lowercase	-2.71	-6.37	-6.59	-1.47	-4.28
punctuation	-1.84	-8.11	-8.47	-1.77	-5.05
all	-25.02	-15.52	-16.15	-4.19	-15.22




Figure 3: Box plot of WER for systems evaluated on the BIGOS dataset.

### 3.2 Overall accuracy of available ASR systems and models

Figure 3 shows the WER box plot for the systems evaluated using the BIGOS dataset. The 3 best ASR models in terms of accuracy are *Whisper Large V3*, *Whisper Cloud* and *Assembly AI best*. The results of the evaluation using the PELCRA dataset are available in the Polish ASR leaderboard<sup>18</sup>

### 3.3 Comparison of accuracy of commercial and freely available ASR systems

Table 4 compares the Word Error Rate (WER) of commercial and free ASR systems. Commercial systems achieve better median, mean and minimal error rates in the BIGOS and PELCRA datasets by approximately 2.5 p.p. and 3.5 p.p., respectively. Furthermore, commercial and free systems show better accuracy for read speech than conversational speech by approximately 17 and 18.5 p.p., respectively.

Table 4: WER statistics for freely available and commercial ASR systems

Dataset	Speech	Systems	Med. WER	Mean WER	Std. WER	Min. WER
BIGOS	read	comm.	12.96	17.26	24.98	0
BIGOS	read	free	14.57	19.76	17.36	2.1
PELCRA	spont.	comm.	29.88	31.29	14.69	5.27
PELCRA	spont.	free	33.58	35.67	17.36	8.74


<sup>18</sup>AMU ASR Leaderboard

### 3.4 Accuracy as a function of model size

Figure 4a shows that as model size increases, WER decreases, indicating better performance. This trend holds for models of the same type, e.g., *whisper* models. There are noticeable accuracy differences in models of the same size trained on different data, such as MMS. Finally, *Nemo* models perform on par with much larger *wav2vec2* models.

### 3.5 Accuracy as a function of speech rate

Figure 4b illustrates the correlation between WER and speech rate, which is measured as the mean number of words uttered per second.



(a) Accuracy as a function of model size.

(b) Accuracy as a function of speech rate range.

Figure 4: Example evaluation results available on the Polish ASR quality dashboard.

## 4 Discussion

### 4.1 Analysis of findings

#### 4.1.1 Impact of normalization

Normalization techniques resulted in significant reductions in error rates for all types of metrics (SER, WER, MER, CER). Applying all methods reduced WER by 16.07 p.p. for the PELCRA dataset and 15.52 p.p. for the BIGOS dataset, highlighting the sensitivity of lexical metrics to spelling and formatting variations.

#### 4.1.2 Determining the best systems among free and commercial

Conversational speech (PELCRA) has higher error rates due to its spontaneous nature, with more variability in style, speed, and pauses. Read speech (BIGOS) is more structured and consistent, resulting in lower WERs.

#### 4.1.3 Impact of model size on accuracy

- *whisper\_large v2*, *whisper\_large*, and *whisper\_large v3* show the best performance with the lowest WERs and the largest model sizes.
- *whisper\_tiny* is the second smallest model and has the highest WER among all evaluated.
- *nemo\_pl\_quartznet* and *nemo\_pl\_multilang* are relatively small models with reasonably low WERs, indicating that they are efficient given their size.

#### 4.1.4 Impact of speech rate on accuracy (WER)

- Both *whisper\_large\_v3* and *whisper\_cloud* perform similarly across speech rates. For rates between 1.5 and 5, most WERs are below 30%. Severe errors occur at lower rates,



while higher rates increase WER, indicating limited robustness for faster speech. Outliers suggest challenging scenarios or truncated audio/transcriptions.

## 4.2 Implications

The developed data curation and evaluation framework offers the following benefits for the research community:

- Establishes a consistent framework for evaluating Polish ASR systems, enhancing reproducibility.
- Facilitates better use of datasets, promoting focused research.
- Encourages data sharing and collaboration, improving resources and progress.
- Identifies gaps, such as the need for detailed metadata and semantic metrics, guiding future studies.

Advantages for industry include:

- Informs public about strengths and weaknesses of available ASR system.
- Proposes a standard evaluation procedure to increase evaluation efficiency.
- Showcases the importance of normalization and utilization of metadata for analysis.
- Provides incentive to companies to showcase superior performance on a public benchmark for marketing purposes.

## 4.3 Limitations and challenges

Future research should include manual transcriptions and annotations to assess the quality of test data Koo *et al.* (2024). Investigating manual annotation of recognition errors to determine the criticality of the error Wirth & Peinl (2022), and automating the classification and correction of erroneous references are other directions to explore. Integrating semantically informed metrics could provide additional insight into accuracy Stokke (2023); Roy (2021). Robustness and bias measurements could be improved by augmenting existing or collecting new recordings representing various usage conditions and Polish speakers demographics. Aksënova *et al.* (2021, 2022)

## 5 Conclusion

The research establishes a framework for evaluating ASR systems. It addresses the issue of limited dataset usage for Polish benchmarking by offering a curated benchmark set derived from 24 publicly available datasets identified in an extensive survey. The evaluation of 7 ASR systems and 25 models revealed notable performance differences between service types, model sizes, and speech types. The study also highlighted potential problems with the test set content that require further examination. This work improves reproducibility and directs future ASR advancements by providing public access to data catalogs, curated datasets, evaluation tools, and dashboards with benchmarking results.

## 6 References

### References

- Aksënova, Alëna, van Esch, Daan, Flynn, James, & Golik, Pavel. 2021. How Might We Create Better Benchmarks for Speech Recognition? *Pages 22–34 of: Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Benchmarking: Past, Present and Future*. Stroudsburg, PA, USA: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Aksënova, Alëna, Chen, Zhehuai, Chiu, Chung-Cheng, van Esch, Daan, Golik, Pavel, Han, Wei, King, Levi, Ramabhadran, Bhuvana, Rosenberg, Andrew, Schwartz, Suzan, & Wang, Gary. 2022. Accented Speech Recognition: Benchmarking, Pre-training, and Diverse Data. *arXiv preprint*, 5.

- Ardila, Rosana, Branson, Megan, Davis, Kelly, Henretty, Michael, Kohler, Michael, Meyer, Josh, Morais, Reuben, Saunders, Lindsay, Tyers, Francis M., & Weber, Gregor. 2019a. Common Voice: A Massively-Multilingual Speech Corpus. *arXiv preprint*, 12.
- Ardila, Rosana, Branson, Megan, Davis, Kelly, Henretty, Michael, Kohler, Michael, Meyer, Josh, Morais, Reuben, Saunders, Lindsay, Tyers, Francis M., & Weber, Gregor. 2019b. Common Voice: A Massively-Multilingual Speech Corpus. *arXiv preprint*, 12.
- Conneau, Alexis, Ma, Min, Khanuja, Simran, Zhang, Yu, Axelrod, Vera, Dalmia, Siddharth, Riesa, Jason, Rivera, Clara, & Bapna, Ankur. 2022. FLEURS: Few-shot Learning Evaluation of Universal Representations of Speech. *arXiv preprint*, 5.
- Gandhi, Sanchit, von Platen, Patrick, & Rush, Alexander M. 2022. ESB: A Benchmark For Multi-Domain End-to-End Speech Recognition. *arXiv preprint*, 10.
- Gerz, Daniela, Su, Pei-Hao, Kuztos, Razvan, Mondal, Avishek, Lis, Michał, Singhal, Eshan, Mrkšić, Nikola, Wen, Tsung-Hsien, & Vulić, Ivan. 2021. Multilingual and Cross-Lingual Intent Detection from Spoken Data. *arXiv preprint*, 4.
- Hsu, Wei-Ning, Sriram, Anuroop, Baevski, Alexei, Likhomanenko, Tatiana, Xu, Qiantong, Pratap, Vineel, Kahn, Jacob, Lee, Ann, Collobert, Ronan, Synnaeve, Gabriel, & Auli, Michael. 2021. Robust wav2vec 2.0: Analyzing Domain Shift in Self-Supervised Pre-Training. *arXiv preprint*, 4.
- Junczyk, Michał. 2023. *Polish ASR Speech Datasets Catalog*. <https://github.com/goodmike31/pl-asr-speech-data-survey>.
- Junczyk, Michał. 2024. A survey of Polish ASR speech datasets. *Poznan Studies in Contemporary Linguistics*, **60**(1), 27–52.
- Koo, Seonmin, Park, Chanjun, Kim, Jinsung, Seo, Jaehyung, Eo, Sugyeong, Moon, Hyeonseok, & Lim, Heuseok. 2023. KEBAP: Korean Error Explainable Benchmark Dataset for ASR and Post-processing. *Pages 4798–4815 of: Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Stroudsburg, PA, USA: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Koo, Seonmin, Park, Chanjun, Kim, Jinsung, Seo, Jaehyung, Eo, Sugyeong, Moon, Hyeonseok, & Lim, Heuseok. 2024. Toward Practical Automatic Speech Recognition and Post-Processing: a Call for Explainable Error Benchmark Guideline. *arXiv preprint*, 1.
- Kriman, Samuel, Beliaev, Stanislav, Ginsburg, Boris, Huang, Jocelyn, Kuchaiev, Oleksii, Lavrukhin, Vitaly, Leary, Ryan, Li, Jason, & Zhang, Yang. 2019. QuartzNet: Deep Automatic Speech Recognition with 1D Time-Channel Separable Convolutions. *arXiv preprint*, 10.
- Liao, Thomas, Taori, Rohan, Raji, Deborah, & Schmidt, Ludwig. 2021. Are We Learning Yet? A Meta Review of Evaluation Failures Across Machine Learning. *In: Vanschoren, Joaquin, & Yeung, Sai-Kit (eds), Proceedings of the Neural Information Processing Systems Track on Datasets and Benchmarks 1*.
- Morris, Andrew Cameron, Maier, Viktoria, & Green, Phil. 2004. From WER and RIL to MER and WIL: improved evaluation measures for connected speech recognition. *Pages 2765–2768 of: Interspeech 2004*. ISCA: ISCA.
- Nathan Lambert. 2023 (9). *In defense of the open LLM leaderboard*.
- Northcutt, Curtis G., Athalye, Anish, & Mueller, Jonas. 2021. Pervasive Label Errors in Test Sets Destabilize Machine Learning Benchmarks. *arXiv preprint*, 3.
- Olson, Randal S., La Cava, William, Orzechowski, Patryk, Urbanowicz, Ryan J., & Moore, Jason H. 2017. PMLB: a large benchmark suite for machine learning evaluation and comparison. *BioData Mining*, **10**(1), 36.
- Pezik, Piotr. 2018. Increasing the Accessibility of Time-Aligned Speech Corpora with Spokes Mix. *In: Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018)*. Miyazaki, Japan: European Language Resources Association (ELRA).

- Pęzik, Piotr, Karasińska, Sylwia, Cichosz, Anna, Jałowiecki, Łukasz, Kaczyński, Konrad, Krawentek, Małgorzata, Walkusz, Karolina, Wilk, Paweł, Kleć, Mariusz, Szklanny, Krzysztof, & Marszałkowski, Szymon. 2023. SpokesBiz – an Open Corpus of Conversational Polish. *arXiv preprint*, 12.
- Pratap, Vineel, Xu, Qiantong, Sriram, Anuroop, Synnaeve, Gabriel, & Collobert, Ronan. 2020. MLS: A Large-Scale Multilingual Dataset for Speech Research. *Pages 2757–2761 of: Interspeech 2020*. ISCA: ISCA.
- Pratap, Vineel, Tjandra, Andros, Shi, Bowen, Tomasello, Paden, Babu, Arun, Kundu, Sayani, Elkahky, Ali, Ni, Zhaocheng, Vyas, Apoorv, Fazel-Zarandi, Maryam, Baevski, Alexei, Adi, Yossi, Zhang, Xiaohui, Hsu, Wei-Ning, Conneau, Alexis, & Auli, Michael. 2023. Scaling Speech Technology to 1,000+ Languages. *arXiv preprint*, 5.
- Radford, Alec, Kim, Jong Wook, Xu, Tao, Brockman, Greg, McLeavey, Christine, & Sutskever, Ilya. 2022. Robust Speech Recognition via Large-Scale Weak Supervision. *arXiv preprint*, 12.
- Ramirez, Francis McCann, Chkhetiani, Luka, Ehrenberg, Andrew, McHardy, Robert, Botros, Rami, Khare, Yash, Vanzo, Andrea, Peyash, Taufiqzaman, Oexle, Gabriel, Liang, Michael, Sklyar, Ilya, Fakhani, Enver, Etefy, Ahmed, McCrystal, Daniel, Flamini, Sam, Donato, Domenic, & Yoshioka, Takuya. 2024. Anatomy of Industrial Scale Multilingual ASR. *arXiv preprint*, 4.
- Rowley, Jennifer, & Slack, Frances. 2004. Conducting a literature review. *Management Research News*, **27**(6), 31–39.
- Roy, Somnath. 2021. Semantic-WER: A Unified Metric for the Evaluation of ASR Transcript for End Usability. *arXiv preprint*, 6.
- Stokke, Espen James. 2023. *Semantic Word Error Rate: A Metric Based on Semantic Distance*. Ph.D. thesis, The University of Bergen.
- Szymański, Piotr, Żelasko, Piotr, Morzy, Mikołaj, Szymczak, Adrian, Żyła-Hoppe, Marzena, Banaśczak, Joanna, Augustyniak, Łukasz, Mizgajski, Jan, & Carmiel, Yishay. 2020. WER we are and WER we think we are. *Pages 3290–3295 of: Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*. Stroudsburg, PA, USA: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wang, Changhan, Rivière, Morgane, Lee, Ann, Wu, Anne, Talnikar, Chaitanya, Haziza, Daniel, Williamson, Mary, Pino, Juan, & Dupoux, Emmanuel. 2021. VoxPopuli: A Large-Scale Multilingual Speech Corpus for Representation Learning, Semi-Supervised Learning and Interpretation. *arXiv preprint*, 1.
- Wirth, Johannes, & Peinl, Rene. 2022. Automatic Speech Recognition in German: A Detailed Error Analysis. *Pages 1–8 of: 2022 IEEE International Conference on Omni-layer Intelligent Systems (COINS)*. IEEE.

## 7 Appendices

Provide additional data, tools’ documentation, and other supplementary materials that are relevant but not central to the article’s narrative.

### Checklist

1. For all authors...
  - (a) Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper’s contributions and scope? [\[Yes\]](#) Abstract and introduction explicitly describes contributions: Survey of datasets, methodology thereof, curated evaluation datasets process and outcomes, system for ASR evaluation, interactive dashboard with benchmark results.

- (b) Did you describe the limitations of your work? [Yes] Limitations include limited representation of Polish speakers, lack of manual transcription verification and unification, limited scope of transcription normalization, lack of support for embedding based metrics, lack of manual analysis of ASR errors, limited availability of recordings with speaker metadata.
  - (c) Did you discuss any potential negative societal impacts of your work? [Yes] In the limitations section, it is mentioned that the evaluation datasets do not encompass all Polish users or the various conditions under which ASR systems are used. However, the results presented can guide the selection of the best-performing ASR systems for use-cases similar to those in the BIGOS evaluation dataset. For new and particularly high-risk scenarios, such as the medical field or specific demographic group, an independent evaluation on a representative dataset is necessary to accurately assess performance and ensure safe, unbiased operation.
  - (d) Have you read the ethics review guidelines and ensured that your paper conforms to them? [Yes] Presented work follows the ethical guidelines. No PII or protected information about individuals is revealed. The author obtained consent to use datasets for evaluation dataset curation and evaluation, either directly or based on licensing terms. Research did not include experiments involving human subjects.
2. If you are including theoretical results...
- (a) Did you state the full set of assumptions of all theoretical results? [N/A]
  - (b) Did you include complete proofs of all theoretical results? [N/A]
3. If you ran experiments (e.g. for benchmarks)...
- (a) Did you include the code, data, and instructions needed to reproduce the main experimental results (either in the supplemental material or as a URL)? [Yes] Code, data and instructions how to reproduce results are available on respective publicly available repositories on Hugging Face and GitHub platforms.
  - (b) Did you specify all the training details (e.g., data splits, hyperparameters, how they were chosen)? [N/A]
  - (c) Did you report error bars (e.g., with respect to the random seed after running experiments multiple times)? [N/A]
  - (d) Did you include the total amount of compute and the type of resources used (e.g., type of GPUs, internal cluster, or cloud provider)? [N/A]
4. If you are using existing assets (e.g., code, data, models) or curating/releasing new assets...
- (a) If your work uses existing assets, did you cite the creators? [Yes] Yes, all authors of existings assets were cited both in submitted article and repositories with curated assets.
  - (b) Did you mention the license of the assets? [Yes] Yes, license types are mentioned in the respective tables describing source datasets, as well as on repositories hosting curated assets.
  - (c) Did you include any new assets either in the supplemental material or as a URL? [Yes] Yes, links to meta-corpora resulting from curation of existing assests were provided.
  - (d) Did you discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose data you're using/curating? [Yes] Yes, the consent from the author of PELCRA corpora to curate dataset for open competition and benchmarking purposes is mentioned.
  - (e) Did you discuss whether the data you are using/curating contains personally identifiable information or offensive content? [Yes] Yes, the lack of PII is mentioned, however the inspection if datasets contain potentially offensive content was not performed.
5. If you used crowdsourcing or conducted research with human subjects...
- (a) Did you include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if applicable? [N/A]
  - (b) Did you describe any potential participant risks, with links to Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals, if applicable? [N/A]
  - (c) Did you include the estimated hourly wage paid to participants and the total amount spent on participant compensation? [N/A]

## A Additional information required by organizers

In the Appendix, we provide additional information. This section will often be part of the supplemental material. Please see the call on the NeurIPS website for links to additional guides on dataset publication.

Submission introducing new datasets must include the following in the supplementary materials:

1. Dataset documentation and intended uses. Recommended documentation frameworks include datasheets for datasets, dataset nutrition labels, data statements for NLP, and accountability frameworks.
2. URL to website/platform where the dataset/benchmark can be viewed and downloaded by the reviewers.
3. URL to Croissant metadata record documenting the dataset/benchmark available for viewing and downloading by the reviewers. You can create your Croissant metadata using e.g. the Python library available here: <https://github.com/mlcommons/croissant>
4. Author statement that they bear all responsibility in case of violation of rights, etc., and confirmation of the data license.
5. Hosting, licensing, and maintenance plan. The choice of hosting platform is yours, as long as you ensure access to the data (possibly through a curated interface) and will provide the necessary maintenance.

## B Additional information relevant to submitted article

### B.1 Dataset splits details

Tables 5 and 6 present logic of data splits applied during curation for BIGOS and PELCRA datasets, respectively.

Table 5: Metadata and partitioning of source datasets – BIGOS dataset

Subset	Original partitioning	BIGOS split process	Entity for BIGOS split
google-fleurs-22	train, test, dev	original splits preserved	N/A
polyai-minds14-21	none	pseudorandom	audio file id
pjatk-clarin_mobile-15	none	pseudorandom	session (speaker id)
pjatk-clarin_studio-15	none	pseudorandom	session (speaker id)
pwr-azon_read-20	none	pseudorandom	session (speaker id)
pwr-azon_spont-20	none	pseudorandom	session (speaker id)
fair-mls-20	train, test, dev	original splits preserved	N/A
mozilla-cv15-23	train, test, dev	original splits preserved	N/A
mailabs-corpus_librivox-19	none	pseudorandom	audio file id
pwr-maleset-unk	none	pseudorandom	audio file id
pwr-shortwords-unk	none	pseudorandom	audio file id
pwr-viu-unk	none	pseudorandom	audio file id

### B.2 Dataset splits details

Table 7 presents metadata fields associated with each individual data item in BIGOS datasets.

Table 6: Metadata and partitioning of source datasets – PELCRA Dataset

<b>Subset</b>	<b>Original partitioning</b>	<b>BIGOS split process</b>	<b>Entity for BIGOS split</b>
ul-diabiz_poleval-22	train, test, dev	original splits preserved	N/A
ul-spokes_biz_bio-23	none	pseudorandom	recording id
ul-spokes_biz_int-23	none	pseudorandom	recording id
ul-spokes_biz_luz-23	none	pseudorandom	recording id
ul-spokes_biz_pod-23	none	pseudorandom	recording id
ul-spokes_biz_pres-23	none	pseudorandom	recording id
ul-spokes_biz_vc-23	none	pseudorandom	recording id
ul-spokes_biz_vc2-23	none	pseudorandom	recording id
ul-spokes_biz_wyw-23	none	pseudorandom	recording id
ul-spokes_mix_emo-18	none	pseudorandom	recording id
ul-spokes_mix_luz-18	none	pseudorandom	recording id
ul-spokes_mix_parl-18	none	pseudorandom	recording id

### **B.3 Dataset contents details**

Tables 8 and 9 present information on licensing and language coverage for BIGOS and PELCRA datasets, respectively.

### **B.4 Dataset contents details**

Tables 10 and 11 present information on domains, speech, and interaction types for BIGOS and PELCRA datasets, respectively.

### **B.5 Dataset contents details**

Tables 12 and 13 present information on sources, acoustic environments and audio recording devices for BIGOS and PELCRA datasets, respectively.

### **B.6 Audio content size metrics**

Tables 14 and 15 present information about number of available transcribed speech material, audio files and recorded speakers for BIGOS and PELCRA datasets, respectively.

Table 7: Attributes in the BIGOS utterance data object

Field name	Description
audioname	Standardized unique identifier for each audio recording in the dataset e.g.
split	Indicates the dataset split the recording belongs (e.g., train, test, validation).
dataset	Source dataset identifier
ref_orig	The original transcript associated with the audio recording.
ref_spoken	Transcription in the spoken domain format.
ref_written	Transcription in the written domain format.
audio	Object for storing audio data in HF datasets format.
sampling_rate	The sampling rate of the audio recording in the dataset. Can be the same as the original or adjusted for standardization.
samplingrate_orig	The original sampling rate of the audio recording.
speaker_id	A unique identifier of the speaker in the recording.
audiopath_bigos	The relative path to the audio file from distributed data archive.
audiopath_local	The absolute path to the extracted audio file, typically in the default hf datasets cache directory.
audio_duration_samples	Recording duration in samples.
audio_duration_seconds	Recording duration in seconds.
speaker_gender	Information about the speaker’s gender in the CommonVoice format. If not available, it is indicated as N/A (Not Available).
speaker_age	Information about the speaker’s age in CommonVoice format. If not available, it is indicated as N/A (Not Available).
speech_rate_words	Speech rate expressed in words per seconds.
speech_rate_chars	Speech rate expressed in characters per seconds.
utterance_length_words	Length of the utterance in words.
utterance_length_chars	Length of the utterance in characters.

## B.7 Evaluated ASR system details

- **Google Cloud Speech-to-Text**<sup>19</sup> supports more than 125 languages and variants. Google’s service offers several useful features, such as noise cancelation, support for streaming, automatic punctuation, and the capability to recognize specific phrases or words when provided with context (e.g., specialized vocabulary or formats for spoken numbers, addresses, years, currencies, etc.). For selected languages, it also provides domain-specific models, multichannel audio support, and filtering of profanity content. Two generations of service are available: v1<sup>20</sup> and v2.<sup>21</sup> For Polish, multiple model variants are available and were evaluated: *v1\_default*, *v1\_latest\_long*, *v1\_latest\_short*, *v1\_command\_and\_search*, *v2\_long* and *v2\_short*.
- **Microsoft’s Azure Speech Service**<sup>22</sup> as of May 2023 supports more than 100 languages and variants. In addition to standard transcription, the Azure Speech Service supports continuous real-time speech recognition and provides robust noise reduction capabilities. It allows users

<sup>19</sup><https://cloud.google.com/speech-to-text>

<sup>20</sup><https://cloud.google.com/speech-to-text/docs/speech-to-text-requests?hl=en>

<sup>21</sup><https://cloud.google.com/speech-to-text/v2/docs?hl=en>

<sup>22</sup><https://azure.microsoft.com/en-us/products/cognitive-services/speech-to-text>

Table 8: BIGOS V2 dataset subset license and language coverage.

<b>Dataset</b>	<b>Codename</b>	<b>License</b>	<b>Languages</b>
Clarin Studio	pjatk-clarin_studio-15	CC-BY	monolingual
Clarin Mobile	pjatk-clarin_mobile-15	CC-BY	monolingual
Munich AI Labs LibriVox	mailabs-corpus_librivox-19	Proprietary	multilingual
Mozilla Common Voice	mozilla-common_voice_15-23	CC-0	multilingual
Multilingual Librispeech	fair-mls-20	CC-BY	multilingual
Azon Read	pwr-azon_read-20	CC-BY-SA	monolingual
Azon Spontaneous	pwr-azon_spont-20	CC-BY-SA	monolingual
PWR Male Set	pwr-maleset-unk	Public domain	monolingual
PWR Short Words	pwr-shortwords-unk	Public domain	monolingual
PWR Very Important Utterances	pwr-viu-unk	Public domain	monolingual
Google FLEURS	google-fleurs-22	CC-BY	multilingual
PolyAI Minds14	polyai-minds14-21	CC-BY	multilingual

Table 9: PELCRA for BIGOS dataset subset license and language coverage.

<b>Dataset</b>	<b>Codename</b>	<b>License</b>	<b>Languages</b>
DiaBiz ASR PolEval 22	ul-diabiz_poleval-22	Public domain	monolingual
SpokesBiz CBIZ_BIO	ul-spokes_biz_bio-23	CC-BY-NC-ND	monolingual
SpokesBiz CBIZ_INT	ul-spokes_biz_int-23	CC-BY-NC-ND	monolingual
SpokesBiz CBIZ_LUZ	ul-spokes_biz_luz-23	CC-BY-NC-ND	monolingual
SpokesBiz CBIZ_POD	ul-spokes_biz_pod-23	CC-BY-NC-ND	monolingual
SpokesBiz CBIZ_PRES	ul-spokes_biz_pres-23	CC-BY-NC-ND	monolingual
SpokesBiz CBIZ_VC	ul-spokes_biz_vc-23	CC-BY-NC-ND	monolingual
SpokesBiz CBIZ_VC2	ul-spokes_biz_vc2-23	CC-BY-NC-ND	monolingual
SpokesBiz CBIZ_WYW	ul-spokes_biz_wyw-23	CC-BY-NC-ND	monolingual
SpokesMix PELCRA_EMO	ul-spokes_mix_emo-18	CC-BY	monolingual
SpokesMix PELCRA_LUZ	ul-spokes_mix_luz-18	CC-BY	monolingual
SpokesMix PELCRA_PARL	ul-spokes_mix_parl-18	CC-BY	monolingual



Table 10: BIGOS V2 dataset subset domains and speech types.

<b>Codename</b>	<b>Domain</b>	<b>Speech type</b>	<b>Interaction type</b>
pjatk-clarin_studio-15	open domain	read	monolog
pjatk-clarin_mobile-15	open domain	read	monolog
mailabs-corpus_librivox-19	audiobook	read	monolog
mozilla-common_voice_15-23	open domain	read	monolog
fair-mls-20	audiobook	read	monolog
pwr-azon_read-20	scientific	read	monolog
pwr-azon_spont-20	scientific	spontaneous	monolog
pwr-maleset-unk	commands	read	monolog
pwr-shortwords-unk	commands	read	monolog
pwr-viu-unk	commands	read	monolog
google-fleurs-22	wikipedia	read	monolog
polyai-minds14-21	banking	read	monolog

Table 11: PELCRA for BIGOS dataset subset domains and speech types.

<b>Codename</b>	<b>Domain</b>	<b>Speech type</b>	<b>Interaction type</b>
ul-diabiz_poleval-22	customer service	spontaneous	dialog
ul-spokes_biz_bio-23	open domain	spontaneous	dialog
ul-spokes_biz_int-23	open domain	spontaneous	dialog
ul-spokes_biz_luz-23	open domain	spontaneous	dialog
ul-spokes_biz_pod-23	open domain	spontaneous	dialog
ul-spokes_biz_pres-23	open domain	spontaneous	dialog
ul-spokes_biz_vc-23	open domain	spontaneous	dialog
ul-spokes_biz_vc2-23	open domain	spontaneous	dialog
ul-spokes_biz_wyw-23	open domain	spontaneous	dialog
ul-spokes_mix_emo-18	open domain	spontaneous	dialog
ul-spokes_mix_luz-18	open domain	spontaneous	dialog
ul-spokes_mix_parl-18	open domain	spontaneous	monolog

Table 12: BIGOS dataset subset speakers, environments, and devices.

Codename	Speech source	Acoustic environment	Audio device
pjatk-clarin_studio-15	volunteers	quiet	studio mic
pjatk-clarin_mobile-15	volunteers	quiet	mobile phone
mailabs-corpus_librivox-19	volunteers	quiet	various
mozilla-common_voice_15-23	crowd	various	various
fair-mls-20	volunteers	various	various
pwr-azon_read-20	volunteers	quiet	studio mic
pwr-azon_spont-20	public speakers	mixed	lavalier
pwr-maleset-unk	volunteers	quiet	studio mic
pwr-shortwords-unk	volunteers	quiet	studio mic
pwr-viu-unk	volunteers	quiet	studio mic
google-fleurs-22	volunteers	quiet	mobile phone
polyai-minds14-21	crowd	quiet	mobile phone

Table 13: PELCRA for BIGOS subsets speakers, environments, and devices.

Codename	Speech source	Acoustic environment	Audio device
ul-diabiz_poleval-22	volunteers	quiet	telephone
ul-spokes_biz_bio-23	volunteers	quiet	lavalier mic
ul-spokes_biz_int-23	volunteers	quiet	lavalier mic
ul-spokes_biz_luz-23	volunteers	quiet	lavalier mic
ul-spokes_biz_pod-23	public speakers	quiet	various
ul-spokes_biz_pres-23	public speakers	quiet	various
ul-spokes_biz_vc-23	volunteers	quiet	lavalier mic
ul-spokes_biz_vc2-23	volunteers	quiet	lavalier mic
ul-spokes_biz_wyw-23	volunteers	quiet	lavalier mic
ul-spokes_mix_emo-18	volunteers	quiet	lavalier mic
ul-spokes_mix_luz-18	volunteers	quiet	lavalier mic

to apply custom models to improve the accuracy of domain-specific terminology. Additional services include text search or analytics on transcribed content, as well as speaker diarization. The *latest default* model for Polish (dated for January 2023) was used, as no specialized model types support this language.

- **Whisper**<sup>23</sup> is an ASR system developed by the OpenAI company. It is trained on a large amount of weakly supervised multilingual and multitask data collected from the Internet Radford *et al.* (2022). According to the literature, Whisper is capable of handling different languages, dialects, and accents, demonstrating strong performance in diverse applications when evaluated on well-known benchmark datasets, e.g. Common Voice Radford *et al.* (2022). Whisper is available via a web API or as a pre-trained model for local use. Five versions of models of varying sizes are available for free download. The large model is available in 3 versions.

source: For this benchmark, the commercial model available via API and eight locally run models were used.

<sup>23</sup><https://github.com/openai/whisper/tree/main>

Table 14: Audio content size metrics for BIGOS dataset

Subset	Transcribed audio [h]	Samples	Speakers
fair-mls-20	107.86	26072	24
google-fleurs-22	12.07	3937	3
mailabs-corpus_librivox-19	32.14	14862	2
mozilla-common_voice_15-23	53.00	36910	2920
pjatk-clarin_mobile-15	12.48	3495	117
pjatk-clarin_studio-15	56.43	13810	553
polyai-minds14-21	3.07	562	3
pwr-azon_read-20	5.72	2788	29
pwr-azon_spont-20	2.14	456	27
pwr-maleset-unk	6.38	4738	3
pwr-shortwords-unk	1.43	939	3
pwr-viu-unk	1.04	2703	3
total	293.76	111272	3945

Table 15: Audio content size metrics for another dataset

Subset	Transcribed audio [h]	Samples	Speakers
ul-diabiz_poleval-22	9.83	8950	170
ul-spokes_biz_bio-23	137.98	54917	158
ul-spokes_biz_int-23	2.25	1109	9
ul-spokes_biz_luz-23	74.27	41966	158
ul-spokes_biz_pod-23	55.00	22807	113
ul-spokes_biz_pres-23	32.25	17174	55
ul-spokes_biz_vc-23	52.07	45272	78
ul-spokes_biz_vc2-23	81.04	25802	84
ul-spokes_biz_wyw-23	28.21	11357	38
ul-spokes_mix_emo-18	25.61	24329	40
ul-spokes_mix_luz-18	18.74	20919	21
ul-spokes_mix_parl-18	12.27	8656	48
total	529.52	283258	972

Table 16: Model sizes and availability of English-only and Multilingual models.

Size	Parameters	English-only model	Multilingual model
tiny	39 M	Yes	Yes
base	74 M	Yes	Yes
small	244 M	Yes	Yes
medium	769 M	Yes	Yes
large	1550 M	No	Yes

- **NVIDIA NeMo** is the ASR system based on the *quartznet* model, which consists of 79 layers and has a total of 18.9 million parameters. Kriman *et al.* (2019) Three models supporting the Polish language are available: *stt\_pl\_fastconformer\_hybrid\_large\_pc*, *stt\_pl\_quartznet15x5* and *stt\_multilingual\_fastconformer\_hybrid\_large\_pc*. The English version was trained on 3,000 hours of public English data. Polish models were fine-tuned from English to Polish on the *Mozilla Common Voice (MCV)* Dataset. Ardila *et al.* (2019b). All models are available for free use under a CC-BY-NC license.
- **MMS**: Facebook AI’s massive multilingual pre-trained model for speech ("MMS"). It was pre-trained on about 500,000 hours of speech data in more than 1,400 languages Pratap *et al.* (2023). The MMS system supports over 1000 languages and other speech processing tasks such as *Text-to-Speech (TTS)* generation and *Speech Language Identification (LID)* <sup>24</sup>. The MMS system is available for free<sup>25</sup> under the CC-BY-NC 4.0 license. The following versions of the fine-tuned model of ASR are available:
  - *1b-fl102* - 1 billion parameter model fine-tuned on *FLEURS* Dataset Conneau *et al.* (2022)
  - *1b-l1107* - 1 billion parameter model fine-tuned *MMS-lab* Pratap *et al.* (2023) Dataset.
  - *1b-all* - 1 billion parameter model fine-tuned on *MMS-lab*, *FLEURS*, *CommonVoice*, *MLS* and *VoxPopuli* datasets. Ardila *et al.* (2019b); Pratap *et al.* (2023, 2020); Wang *et al.* (2021)
- **Wav2Vec** is the automated speech recognition (ASR) system created by Facebook AI. It employs self-supervision to learn from unlabeled training data. Upon its launch in 2020, wav2vec2 exceeded the top semi-supervised approach with only a fraction of labeled training data Hsu *et al.* (2021). Two models fine-tuned for Polish are available on the Hugging Face platform: *xls-r-1b-polish* and *large\_xlsr-53-polish*.
- **Assembly AI**<sup>26</sup> provides an advanced automatic speech recognition service supporting multiple languages. Key features include real-time transcription, automatic punctuation, and robust noise cancellation. The service supports domain-specific vocabulary through custom models, filtering of sensitive content and integration with various platforms via a web API. The system is designed to handle diverse accents and dialects, ensuring high accuracy across different use cases. According to the authors, their system "leverages a diverse training Dataset comprising unsupervised (12.5M hours), supervised (188k hours), and pseudo-labeled (1.6M hours) data across four languages" Ramirez *et al.* (2024). It is also reported that the *Universal-1* model achieves comparative WER scores to larger and more computationally expensive models, such as Whisper large and Canary-1B. Ramirez *et al.* (2024). The amount of training data for Polish is not reported.

## B.8 Normalization methods

Table 19 contains overview of scope of normalization of each available method.

## B.9 Evaluation results

**Accuracy per speaker genders** Figure 6 shows the difference in WER for the speaker groups of different gender. Positive values indicate bias toward male speakers, while negative values indicate bias toward female speakers. Values close to zero indicate lack of bias.

**Accuracy per speaker age groups** Table 20 shows the mean WER for age groups in the PELCRA dataset. Figure 7 shows the standard deviation of WER in all age groups. Lower values indicate a more consistent accuracy for all groups.

<sup>24</sup><https://huggingface.co/spaces/mms-meta/MMS>

<sup>25</sup><https://huggingface.co/facebook/mms-1b-all>

<sup>26</sup>Assembly AI




Figure 5: ASR systems accuracy across speaker age groups.




Figure 6: ASR systems accuracy across speaker gender groups.

Table 17: ASR systems evaluated in the study.

<b>Shortname</b>	<b>System</b>	<b>Model</b>
assembly_best	assembly_ai	best
assembly_nano	assembly_ai	nano
azure_latest	azure	latest
google_cmd_search	google	command_and_search
google_default	google	default
google_long	google	latest_long
google_short	google	latest_short
google_v2_long	google_v2	long
google_v2_short	google_v2	short
mms_all	mms	1b-all
mms_102	mms	1b-fl102
mms_1107	mms	1b-11107
nemo_multilang	nemo	stt_multilingual_fastconformer_hybrid_large_pc
nemo_pl_confomer	nemo	stt_pl_fastconformer_hybrid_large_pc
nemo_pl_quartznet	nemo	stt_pl_quartznet15x5
w2v-53-pl	wav2vec2	large-xlsr-53-polish
w2v-1b-pl	wav2vec2	xls-r-1b-polish
whisper_cloud	whisper_cloud	whisper-1
whisper_base	whisper_local	base
whisper_large_v1	whisper_local	large-v1
whisper_large_v2	whisper_local	large-v2
whisper_large_v3	whisper_local	large-v3
whisper_medium	whisper_local	medium
whisper_small	whisper_local	small
whisper_tiny	whisper_local	tiny

Table 18: Evaluated ASR systems usage cost and license type.

Shortname	Usage cost	License
assembly_best	commercial	Proprietary
assembly_nano	commercial	Proprietary
azure_latest	commercial	Proprietary
google_cmd_search	commercial	Proprietary
google_default	commercial	Proprietary
google_long	commercial	Proprietary
google_short	commercial	Proprietary
google_v2_long	commercial	Proprietary
google_v2_short	commercial	Proprietary
mms_all	free	CC-BY-NC
mms_102	free	CC-BY-NC
mms_1107	free	CC-BY-NC
nemo_multilang	free	CC-BY
nemo_pl_confomer	free	CC-BY
nemo_pl_quartznet	free	CC-BY
w2v-53-pl	free	Apache
w2v-1b-pl	free	Apache
whisper_cloud	commercial	Proprietary
whisper_base	free	MIT
whisper_large_v1	free	MIT
whisper_large_v2	free	MIT
whisper_large_v3	free	MIT
whisper_medium	free	MIT
whisper_small	free	MIT
whisper_tiny	free	MIT

Table 19: Methods of normalizing references and hypotheses.

Normalization method	Scope
blanks removal	Elimination of superfluous white spaces.
lowercasing	Conversion of all characters to lowercase.
punctuation removal	Removal of punctuation symbols.
lexicon-based normalization	Removal of specific words e.g. fillers "um", "mhm" etc. Unification of spelling e.g. Kissindzer -> Kissinger
tags removal	Removal of tags e.g. 'trunc' in PELCRA Dataset.




Figure 7: ASR systems accuracy across speaker age groups.



Table 20: Mean WER across systems and age ranges. PELCRA dataset.

<b>System</b>	<b>20s</b>	<b>30s</b>	<b>40s</b>	<b>60s</b>	<b>70s</b>	<b>Std.</b>	<b>Range</b>
assembly_nano	62.88	66.14	78.59	70.49	70.46	5.9	15.71
google_v2_long	33.84	36.31	39.62	23.64	30.68	6.09	15.98
google_long	38.91	37.93	39.33	24.23	28.64	6.93	15.1
whisper_large_v2	30.01	27.73	31.39	15.49	32.88	6.98	17.39
assembly_best	28.37	30.24	38.3	20.94	37.66	7.18	17.36
whisper_medium	28.73	37.38	36.84	19.16	32.74	7.47	18.22
google_short	31.8	32.13	46.57	25.47	33.74	7.73	21.1
whisper_large_v1	32.65	26.38	38.59	18.24	32.77	7.74	20.35
whisper_large_v3	29.13	26.69	38.05	16.87	32.13	7.8	21.18
google_cmd_search	39.71	46.87	53.46	32.68	40.94	7.84	20.78
whisper_cloud	24.32	26.5	32.41	14.13	34.5	8.01	20.37
mms_all	39.45	48.35	55.13	34.22	42.68	8.08	20.91
mms_102	50.05	53.28	62.99	43.78	63.16	8.41	19.38
w2v-1b-pl	49.6	50.59	60.09	36.41	45.07	8.63	23.68
azure_latest	44.67	44.92	43.38	29.78	26.6	8.93	18.32
mms_1107	52.41	50.58	61.26	35.3	47.75	9.39	25.96
google_v2_short	36.64	42.1	53.69	28.22	30.95	10.12	25.47
google_default	47.32	51.8	58.04	31.94	39.17	10.3	26.1
nemo_pl_quartznet	44.83	50.18	62.07	33.55	51.13	10.38	28.52
nemo_pl_confomer	44.68	52.52	62.65	34.39	54.62	10.72	28.26
w2v-53-pl	57.59	62.35	69.96	41.41	50.99	10.89	28.55
nemo_multilang	53.25	60.79	64.07	33.88	52.67	11.71	30.19
whisper_small	36.7	47.93	82.85	24.1	41.72	22.04	58.75
whisper_base	55.58	53.59	68.69	120.52	51.49	29.04	69.03
whisper_tiny	75.62	228.49	94.38	41.07	165.15	75.27	187.42
median	39.71	47.93	55.13	31.94	40.94	8.41	21.1
average	42.75	51.67	54.9	34.00	46.81	12.54	31.76
std	12.43	38.63	16.52	21.53	27.07	14.01	34.76