

# Speech Recognition with LLMs Adapted to Disordered Speech Using Reinforcement Learning

Chirag Nagpal\* Subhashini Venugopalan\* Jimmy Tobin Marilyn Ladewig  
Katherine Heller Katrin Tomanek†  
Google Research  
Mountain View, USA

*Abstract*—We introduce a large language model (LLM) capable of processing speech inputs and show that tuning it further with reinforcement learning on human preference (RLHF) enables it to adapt better to disordered speech than traditional fine-tuning. Our method replaces low-frequency text tokens in an LLM’s vocabulary with audio tokens and enables the model to recognize speech by fine-tuning it on speech with transcripts. We then use RL with rewards based on syntactic and semantic accuracy measures generalizing the LLM further to recognize disordered speech. While the resulting LLM does not outperform existing systems for speech recognition we find that tuning with reinforcement learning using custom rewards leads to substantially better performance than supervised fine-tuning of the language model, specifically when adapting to speech in a different setting. This presents a compelling alternative tuning strategy for speech recognition using large language models.

*Index Terms*—ASR, LLMs, RLHF, Disordered Speech

## I. INTRODUCTION

Recent research has advanced multimodal potential of large language models (LLM) improving their visual processing capabilities [1]–[4] in addition to their knowledge and language understanding. Increasing the capabilities of LLMs to process audio while retaining their linguistic capabilities [5]–[7] will enable further interesting applications particularly with voice controlled automation that can encompass additional contextual cues. The ability to recognize speech in conjunction with the additional visual and textual context that LLMs can process could be particularly beneficial to people with accessibility needs such as individuals with speech impairments. A step in this direction is to investigate strategies to enable automatic speech recognition (ASR) using LLMs. Here, our goal is two-fold, we want to enable training an existing LLM to recognize speech inputs, further, we investigate strategies to adapt the model to recognize disordered speech.

**LLM-based ASR.** While recent work has shown how the architecture of larger LLMs can be modified [6], [7] and trained to recognize speech comparable to state of the art ASR models, it is still unclear if this is achievable with smaller LLMs and whether such models can be adapted further e.g., in a low resource setting. Many early works look at revising the outputs of ASR systems using LLMs [8]–[10] but only a few have started looking at tuning an LLM directly to recognize speech. Most of these [7], [11], [12] work by utilizing a speech encoder to extract embeddings, and often compress or learn

a linear projection to the language model’s embedding space, and then tune the model to recognize speech. Our work is more similar to [5] where they discretize the audio embeddings and use the discrete units as input rather than directly training from the embeddings. However, while [5] expand the vocabulary of the LLM prior to tuning it, we simply repurpose low frequency text tokens in the vocabulary for audio and tune the LLM to enable the model to recognize speech.

**Semantic distance measures for ASR.** To adapt the LLM based ASR system to specific domains, we propose tuning of the model using RL with a reward towards preserving semantics of the speech. Established ASR systems typically rely on quantitative scalar metrics such as Word Error Rate (WER) for assessment of syntactic accuracy. However, in some cases, even when word error rates are relatively low, the semantic changes introduced by the errors can critically affect the intended meaning, and fall short on determining comprehensibility. e.g. “Not so good, okay.” vs. “That’s so good, okay”. This issue is exacerbated in the case of disordered speech where ASR systems have higher than normal error rates. To mitigate such issues, [13], [14] propose methods that learn semantic distance measures to compare ASR systems. [15], [16] take it a step further to build systems that use human preference, i.e. clinician or speech language pathologist labels to determine whether transcripts preserve meaning. While [15] proposes a modification to re-weight terms when computing the existing BERTScore [17] metric, [16] propose an approach training an LLM as a judge to evaluate if a transcript preserves the intended meaning. In this work, we evaluate the use of both WER and the LLM Meaning Preservation (MP) judge as rewards towards adapting an LLM-based ASR system on disordered speech, and show it to outperform fine-tuning.

## II. LLMs FOR ASR

For our first stage we tune an LLM to function as an ASR model. Specifically, we enable a decoder-only transformer based LLM to take text and audio tokens as input and generate text corresponding to the transcript. This is made possible from the observation that the inputs to an LLM are essentially sequences of arbitrary integers obtained when text is tokenized and mapped to a vocabulary. In a similar manner, we first tokenize the audio using an audio tokenizer and discretize it to a very small finite vocabulary. We further map the audio tokens

\*equal contribution, †lead




Fig. 1: **Using an LLM for ASR:** Our approach involves first clustering the audio embeddings to the LLMs vocabulary space. Followed by supervised finetuning on a mixture of disordered speech. In the final step we use reinforcement learning to improve the model’s output in terms of Word Error Rate and human assessed meaning preservation quality.

to replace text tokens in the language model’s vocabulary. This setting while introducing no difference to the usual decoder-only setup for pure text is now capable of processing multimodal data as some of the tokens in the vocabulary now represent audio (Fig. 1). This model can then be tuned as a regular LLM without any changes to the architecture or training infrastructure. We describe these aspects below.

#### A. Using Audio Tokens in a standard LLM

The first step towards modifying the LLM to understand speech is to tokenize the speech. Our goal is to retain the architecture of the LLM as-is while allowing it to also handle audio. Since the LLM first applies a tokenizer such as a sentence-piece [18] or word-piece [19] tokenizer to break text into a fixed vocabulary and takes discrete indices in the vocabulary as input, our key idea is to simply replace certain tokens in the vocabulary with audio tokens.

**Tokenizing and discretizing audio.** We use USM speech encoder [20] trained similarly to w2v-BERT [20] and produces tokens at the rate of 25Hz. We extract embeddings from the middle layers (16<sup>th</sup> layer) and cluster the embeddings into 1024 clusters. Pilot experiments of varying layers, cluster sizes showed less difference. Given a new speech sample, we first encode the audio into embeddings and identify the closest cluster center corresponding to each audio embedding, thus mapping the audio tokens to a sequence of cluster ids.

**Re-mapping text tokens as audio tokens.** Next, we replace some of the text tokens in the LLM vocabulary with audio tokens. We do that by mapping the 1024 audio cluster ids to the last 1024 vocabulary indices corresponding to the least frequent text-tokens. This design choice is motivated from the fact that the last few tokens typically represent low frequency multilingual or unicode characters that can be re-purposed as our audio tokens. Once remapped, we perform standard supervised fine-tuning [21] on ASR data where the inputs are the discretized audio tokens and output is the corresponding text transcript.

#### B. Supervised Finetuning an Audio LLM

Since our goal is to not only train the model to recognize speech but also adapt it to more diverse disordered speech,

we compare fine-tuning of the LLM to recognize speech on different mixtures of standard speech datasets and disordered speech data. With the tokenized audio data we use standard fine tuning recipes to tune the model. We first describe the specific model we use and then share parameters of the finetuning recipe experimented.

### III. MODEL AND DATASET

**Using Gemma 2B for ASR** For the base LLM we use the open-source Gemma 2B [21] model which is a decoder only transformer [22] with Multi Query Attention [23]. The Gemma [21] model family vocabulary consists of 256k tokens, and replacing the last 1024 tokens in the vocabulary should not affect the underlying LLM capabilities in understanding or generation.

**Datasets.** We use two datasets of English speech in our study.

- **LibriSpeech** [24] is a large-scale dataset consisting of training data of a 1000 hours standard speech from English audio books read by single speakers in a clean environment. We use the dev-clean split of the data for validation.
- **Euphonia** [25] is a dataset of disordered speech of over 1M utterances (~1k hrs) on everyday topics from speakers with diverse speech impairments. We use the SI splits described in [26] consisting of over 900k utterances from 1246 speakers for training, a test set of 5699 utterances from 200 speakers, and a small validation set of 343 utterances from 24 speakers. The splits do not overlap in speakers or in phrases.

**Tuning details.** Prior to training, we tokenize the audio datasets. We learn the clusters for the audio tokens based only on the LibriSpeech dataset. With the tokenized audio, we perform supervised finetuning of the Gemma model with a learning rate of  $5 \times 10^{-6}$ , and a cosine decay schedule, using the Adam optimizer. We experimented with different input drop outs, we found  $5 \times 10^{-2}$  to be the best value. Since our goal is to improve performance on disordered speech, we also experiment tuning of the LLM with different mixtures of the datasets. We experiment training the model on Librispeech-only, a 50:50 mix, and a 30:70 mix of Euphonia and Librispeech. We evaluated the model on a held out validation set

of both the Librispeech and Euphonia datasets and used the checkpoint with the lowest WER as our SFT model.

#### IV. DOMAIN ADAPTATION WITH RLHF

Our eventual goal is to adapt the LLM based ASR model to recognize disordered speech. This can be done by tuning the model further on the disordered speech data. In their seminal work [27] demonstrated that RL can be used to finetune LLM outputs on a relatively small number of examples to maximize metrics learnt from human feedback. Motivated by this we explore tuning the model with a reward from two sources of feedback, (1) **WER** between the transcript and ground truth, this provides a syntactic measure of accuracy of the prediction; and (2) **Meaning Preservation (MP)** [16], an LLM-based semantic measure of correctness.

**Meaning Preservation reward model.** In [16], an LLM is trained specifically to mimic human judgements on whether ASR system predicted transcript preserves meaning compared to the groundtruth. While they use a 62B parameter LLM for this task, we train a Gemma-2B reward model on the same binary classification task of meaning preservation introduced in [28] on 2840 pairs of predicted and gold transcripts using a cross-entropy loss on the 0-1 labels. On a test set of about 1k examples our model achieved a 0.87 AUC, compared to the 0.89 AUC obtained by [16].

**WER signal.** Several prior works on RLHF have found that RL training is especially sensitive to exploiting spurious correlations in the reward model leading to a phenomenon known as ‘reward hacking’ [29]–[32]. To mitigate this we also include WER metric as an additional signal. This ensures that the model is rewarded to generate responses with low WER while maximizing meaning preservation score.

The final reward signal  $R$  used for alignment is given by Eqn. 1

$$R(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; \mathbf{y}^*) := \gamma \cdot \text{MP}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}^*) + \ln \left( 1 - \text{WER}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}^*) \right) \quad (1)$$

here  $\mathbf{x}$  is the original prompt,  $\mathbf{y}$  is the predicted transcript,  $\mathbf{y}^*$  the ground truth transcript, and  $\gamma$  is a hyperparameter to trade-off the relative weight of the WER and meaning preservation score. Note that in this final reward function, the WER is logarithmically transformed to have the same scale as MP.

**Reinforcement Learning.** We use Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) with a clipped gradient objective and KL regularization as proposed in [33] for optimizing the combined reward in Equation 1. We experiment with different values for  $\gamma$  and select checkpoints based on WER and MP scores on the validation set. We report results on val. and test splits.

### V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### A. Making an LLM ASR model

For training the base LLM-ASR model, Fig. 2 compares curves of the three mixtures of Euphonia:Librispeech data. We find that augmenting training with the disordered speech data, specifically the 30:70 mixture (Table I) shows significantly improved performance on the disordered speech data while retaining performance on the standard Librispeech dev-clean

#### Validation Loss on Disordered Speech (Euphonia)




Fig. 2: Cross entropy Loss vs. Learning Steps of the Gemma 2B base LLM for different training mixtures of Librispeech and Euphonia data on a held-out validation set. Augmenting the disordered speech training data with generic ASR data from Librispeech improves generalization.

set. Training only on the Librispeech data or only the Euphonia datasets leads to extremely poor generalization highlighting the substantial differences in the characteristics of the datasets.

Dataset mixture	Euphonia Test		Euphonia Dev		Librispeech Dev	
	WER ↓	MP ↑	WER ↓	MP ↑	WER ↓	MP ↑
Librispeech Only	70.9	39.0	66.5	31.8	17.1	86.6
30:70 mixture	<b>50.4*</b>	<b>48.2*</b>	<b>47.3*</b>	<b>48.1*</b>	17.2	85.6

TABLE I: Training the LLM on ASR data with a 30:70 mix of Euphonia:Librispeech leads to significant (\*) improvements on Euphonia and little loss on Librispeech. ↑ and ↓ indicate higher or lower is better respectively. **bold** shows best score.

#### B. Adaptation with RLHF

In Table III we compare both continued fine-tuning and RL based on reward signals for tuning and adapting the LLM-ASR model on disordered speech. We find that both WER and meaning preservation provide strong signals for adaptation. Even with significant hyper parameter tuning we find that fine-tuning directly on the disordered speech data doesn’t help at all, whereas RLHF (all values of  $\gamma$ ) show significant improvements ( $p < 1 \times 10^{-8}$ ) relative to the SFT 30:70 mixture model which is the starting point for RLHF. Significance is computed using two-sided t-tests.

In particular we find that setting equal weight to WER and the meaning preservation reward i.e. ( $\gamma = 1.0$ ) has the best trade-off showing significantly improved MP score ( $p < 0.0003$ ) without significant drop in WER ( $p = 0.54$ ) compared to RLHF-WER ( $\gamma = 0.00$ ). Table II shows examples of a few ground truth and predicted transcripts from the two models. We can see from the examples that even on transcripts where both models have high WERs, the signal from meaning preservation ( $\gamma = 1.0$ ) improves the final prediction.

#### C. Ablation: RLHF weights and impact on MP score

We also show ablations at different values of  $\gamma$  in Table III. Fig. 3(b) compares MP score on Euphonia test and dev, and

TABLE II: Examples selected based on human evaluation of transcripts on meaning preservation and error type of the RLHF models show that trading-off WER slightly for a significant gain in MP score ( $\gamma = 1.00$ ) leads to better predictions overall.

Ground Truth	Severity	RLHF ( $\gamma = 0.0$ )	WER	RLHF ( $\gamma = 1.0$ )	WER
"not so good today"	MILD	"not so good to the."	(0.5)	"not so good to day."	(0.5)
"every one of my family listens to music"	MODERATE	"every once in my frame and listen to music"	(0.62)	"everybody in my family listens to music"	(0.38)
"dancing is so much fun"	MODERATE	"that's so much fun."	(0.40)	"dancing so much fun."	(0.20)
"are you comfortable?"	MODERATE	"are you going to school?"	(1.0)	"are you comfortable with it?"	(0.67)
"happy birthday dear friend."	SEVERE	"absolutely your friend."	(0.75)	"happy birthday to your friend."	(0.50)
"as soon as possible"	SEVERE	"it soon adds pounds him volume"	(1.0)	"a soon as possible."	(0.25)


TABLE III: Adapting the LLM based ASR model to disordered speech on Euphonia with fine-tuning and RLHF.  $\uparrow$  and  $\downarrow$  indicate higher or lower is better respectively. **bold** shows best score, and \* is significant w.r.t **WER** ( $\gamma = 0.00$ ) strategy.

Tuning strategy	Euphonia Test		Euphonia Dev		Librispeech Dev	
	WER $\downarrow$	MP $\uparrow$	WER $\downarrow$	MP $\uparrow$	WER $\downarrow$	MP $\uparrow$
Base SFT model	50.4	48.2	47.3	48.1	17.2	85.6
Continued SFT	57.1	42.8	59.2	40.5	22.9	73.2
RLHF <b>WER + MP</b>						
<b>WER</b> ( $\gamma = 0.00$ )	<b>41.0</b>	50.4	<b>40.1</b>	47.5	<b>20.2</b>	75.7
+ <b>MP</b> ( $\gamma = 0.25$ )	41.7	51.3	41.7	48.7	22.4	74.7
+ <b>MP</b> ( $\gamma = 0.50$ )	41.2	52.9	41.1	49.0	23.9	72.2
+ <b>MP</b> ( $\gamma = 1.00$ )	42.6	<b>55.7*</b>	42.9	<b>52.5*</b>	22.0	<b>76.2*</b>

we see that increasing the strength of  $\gamma$  when combining MP score in the reward signal, there are substantial improvements in meaning preservation with little decline (insignificant  $p = 0.54$ ) in WER.

#### D. Break down by severity

Euphonia test set also includes labels for speaker-level severity annotated by Speech and Language Pathologists (SLP). Fig. 3(a) compares the model performance on meaning preservation for each severity level and we observe that RLHF models show improved scores across all severity levels, even more so when  $\gamma = 1$ . We also observe larger improvements on individuals with severity ratings as moderate and severe.



(a) MP score sliced by severity. (b) MP score vs strength of  $\gamma$ .

Fig. 3: Higher strength of  $\gamma$  leads to improvement in meaning preservation on the Euphonia val and test sets, and for all severity levels.

#### E. Human evaluation

We performed human evaluations, where an SLP assessed the error type and severity of the error (meaning preservation) on a 3-point<sup>1</sup> scale on 220 examples from the RLHF-**WER**

TABLE IV: Human evaluation of model outputs support the analysis from automated metrics.

Statistic (# samples = 220)	$\gamma = 0.0$	$\gamma = 1.0$
<b>Average Primary Assessment</b> (Human MP)	29.10%	40.45%
<b>Accuracy</b> (Human vs. Model MP)	85.90%	81.36%
<b>Spearman</b> ( $\rho$ ) (Human vs. Model MP)	0.684*	0.639*

+ **MP** ( $\gamma = 0$  and  $1.0$ ) models. In Table IV we list the aggregated statistics considering all errors judged by SLP as *severe* as negative ( $-ve$ ) and the rest as positive ( $+ve$ ). We find that the number of severe errors as judged by the SLP dropped significantly for  $\gamma = 1.0$  model and that the model based evaluations were significantly correlated ( $\rho=0.684$  and  $\rho=0.639$ ) and predictive of the human assessments.

The SLP ratings also supported the analysis in Sec. V-B that the model with  $\gamma = 1.0$  preserved meaning on more of the utterances. The SLP also identified the types of errors made by both the models and found more normalization errors on the model tuned with MP score weight  $\gamma = 1.0$ . Some examples of these are highlighted in Table II.

## VI. SUMMARY/CONCLUSION

In this paper we proposed a new strategy for ASR adapted to a different domain such as disordered speech based on an existing LLM backbone. Our proposed technique uses a frozen audio encoder and existing LLM architecture, and demonstrates how audio tokens can be mapped to text tokens in the language model and tuned to enable the LLM to recognize speech. We demonstrated that supervised finetuning by adding disordered speech data with a large open-domain parallel speech to text corpus followed by reinforcement learning on just the disordered speech data from the domain led to significant improvements in the model performance relative to standard finetuning on domain specific data. In particular, we demonstrated how reward signals can be obtained on measures of both syntactic and semantic accuracy using a second LLM to predict meaning preservation scores on the generated transcripts. Our results demonstrate a promising approach to adapting LLMs to recognize speech on a different domain using RL. Our experiments were on the open source Gemma model, and it remains as future work to apply this with other similar and larger models, as well as models languages other than English [34], [35]. Developing better audio token discretization strategies and combining multiple reward signals are also interesting future directions.

<sup>1</sup>Meaning Completely Preserved, Mild Error, Severe Error

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. Dubey, A. Jauhri, A. Pandey, A. Kadian, A. Al-Dahle, A. Letman, A. Mathur, A. Schelten, A. Yang, A. Fan *et al.*, “The llama 3 herd of models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024.
- [2] L. Beyer, A. Steiner, A. S. Pinto, A. Kolesnikov, X. Wang, D. Salz, M. Neumann, I. Alabdulmohsin, M. Tschannen, E. Bugliarello *et al.*, “PaliGemma: A versatile 3b vlm for transfer,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.07726*, 2024.
- [3] G. Team, R. Anil, S. Borgeaud, Y. Wu, J.-B. Alayrac, J. Yu, R. Soricut, J. Schalkwyk, A. M. Dai, A. Hauth *et al.*, “Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*, 2023.
- [4] H. Liu, C. Li, Q. Wu, and Y. J. Lee, “Visual instruction tuning,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 36, 2023.
- [5] D. Zhang, S. Li, X. Zhang, J. Zhan, P. Wang, Y. Zhou, and X. Qiu, “Speechgpt: Empowering large language models with intrinsic cross-modal conversational abilities,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.11000*, 2023.
- [6] P. K. Rubenstein, C. Asawaroengchai, D. D. Nguyen, A. Bapna, Z. Boros, F. d. C. Quiry, P. Chen, D. E. Badawy, W. Han, E. Kharitonov *et al.*, “Audiopalm: A large language model that can speak and listen,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.12925*, 2023.
- [7] Y. Fathullah, C. Wu, E. Lakomkin, J. Jia, Y. Shanguan, K. Li, J. Guo, W. Xiong, J. Mahadeokar, O. Kalinli *et al.*, “Prompting large language models with speech recognition abilities,” in *ICASSP 2024-2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 13 351–13 355.
- [8] T. Chen, C. Allauzen, Y. Huang, D. Park, D. Rybach, W. R. Huang, R. Cabrera, K. Audhkhasi, B. Ramabhadran, P. J. Moreno *et al.*, “Large-scale language model rescoring on long-form data,” in *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–5.
- [9] X. Zheng, C. Zhang, and P. C. Woodland, “Adapting gpt, gpt-2 and bert language models for speech recognition,” in *2021 IEEE Automatic speech recognition and understanding workshop (ASRU)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 162–168.
- [10] L. Xu, Y. Gu, J. Kolehmainen, H. Khan, A. Gandhe, A. Rastrow, A. Stolcke, and I. Bulyko, “Rescorebert: Discriminative speech recognition rescoring with bert,” in *ICASSP 2022-2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 6117–6121.
- [11] J. Wu, Y. Gaur, Z. Chen, L. Zhou, Y. Zhu, T. Wang, J. Li, S. Liu, B. Ren, L. Liu *et al.*, “On decoder-only architecture for speech-to-text and large language model integration,” in *2023 IEEE Automatic Speech Recognition and Understanding Workshop (ASRU)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–8.
- [12] Z. Ma, G. Yang, Y. Yang, Z. Gao, J. Wang, Z. Du, F. Yu, Q. Chen, S. Zheng, S. Zhang *et al.*, “An embarrassingly simple approach for llm with strong asr capacity,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.08846*, 2024.
- [13] J. Tobin, Q. Li, S. Venugopalan, K. Seaver, R. Cave, and K. Tomanek, “Assessing asr model quality on disordered speech using bertscore,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.10591*, 2022.
- [14] S. Kim, A. Arora, D. Le, C.-F. Yeh, C. Fuegen, O. Kalinli, and M. L. Seltzer, “Semantic distance: A new metric for asr performance analysis towards spoken language understanding,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.02138*, 2021.
- [15] J. Shor, R. A. Bi, S. Venugopalan, S. Ibara, R. Goldenberg, and E. Rivlin, “Clinical bertscore: An improved measure of automatic speech recognition performance in clinical settings,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.05737*, 2023.
- [16] K. Tomanek, J. Tobin, S. Venugopalan, R. Cave, K. Seaver, J. R. Green, and R. Heywood, “Large language models as a proxy for human evaluation in assessing the comprehensibility of disordered speech transcription,” in *ICASSP 2024 - 2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2024, pp. 10 846–10 850.
- [17] T. Zhang, V. Kishore, F. Wu, K. Q. Weinberger, and Y. Artzi, “Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09675*, 2019.
- [18] T. Kudo, “Sentencepiece: A simple and language independent subword tokenizer and detokenizer for neural text processing,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.06226*, 2018.
- [19] J. Devlin, M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova, “Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [20] Y. Zhang, W. Han, J. Qin, Y. Wang, A. Bapna, Z. Chen, N. Chen, B. Li, V. Axelrod, G. Wang *et al.*, “Google usm: Scaling automatic speech recognition beyond 100 languages,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.01037*, 2023.
- [21] G. Team, T. Mesnard, C. Hardin, R. Dadashi, S. Bhupatiraju, S. Pathak, L. Sifre, M. Rivière, M. S. Kale, J. Love *et al.*, “Gemma: Open models based on gemini research and technology,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.08295*, 2024.
- [22] A. Vaswani, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.03762*, 2017.
- [23] N. Shazeer, “Fast transformer decoding: One write-head is all you need,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.02150*, 2019.
- [24] V. Panayotov, G. Chen, D. Povey, and S. Khudanpur, “Librispeech: An asr corpus based on public domain audio books,” in *2015 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2015, pp. 5206–5210.
- [25] R. L. MacDonald, P.-P. Jiang, J. Cattiau, R. Heywood, R. Cave, K. Seaver, M. A. Ladewig, J. Tobin, M. P. Brenner, P. C. Nelson *et al.*, “Disordered speech data collection: Lessons learned at 1 million utterances from project euphonia,” in *Interspeech*, vol. 2021, 2021, pp. 4833–4837.
- [26] J. R. Green, R. L. MacDonald, P.-P. Jiang, J. Cattiau, R. Heywood, R. Cave, K. Seaver, M. A. Ladewig, J. Tobin, M. P. Brenner *et al.*, “Automatic speech recognition of disordered speech: Personalized models outperforming human listeners on short phrases,” in *Interspeech*, vol. 2021, 2021, pp. 4778–4782.
- [27] L. Ouyang, J. Wu, X. Jiang, D. Almeida, C. Wainwright, P. Mishkin, C. Zhang, S. Agarwal, K. Slama, A. Ray *et al.*, “Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 35, pp. 27 730–27 744, 2022.
- [28] J. Tobin, P. Nelson, B. MacDonald, R. Heywood, R. Cave, K. Seaver, A. Desjardins, P.-P. Jiang, and J. R. Green, “Automatic speech recognition of conversational speech in individuals with disordered speech,” *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, pp. 1–10, 2024.
- [29] J. Eisenstein, C. Nagpal, A. Agarwal, A. Beirami, A. D’Amour, D. Dvijotham, A. Fisch, K. Heller, S. Pfohl, D. Ramachandran *et al.*, “Helping or herding? reward model ensembles mitigate but do not eliminate reward hacking,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.09244*, 2023.
- [30] L. Gao, J. Schulman, and J. Hilton, “Scaling laws for reward model overoptimization,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 10 835–10 866.
- [31] R. Y. Pang, V. Padmakumar, T. Sellam, A. P. Parikh, and H. He, “Reward gaming in conditional text generation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.08714*, 2022.
- [32] Z. Wang, C. Nagpal, J. Berant, J. Eisenstein, A. D’Amour, S. Koyejo, and V. Veitch, “Transforming and combining rewards for aligning large language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.00742*, 2024.
- [33] J. Schulman, F. Wolski, P. Dhariwal, A. Radford, and O. Klimov, “Proximal policy optimization algorithms,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017.
- [34] A. Q. Jiang, A. Sablayrolles, A. Roux, A. Mensch, B. Savary, C. Bamford, D. S. Chaplot, D. d. I. Casas, E. B. Hanna, F. Bressand *et al.*, “Mixtral of experts,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088*, 2024.
- [35] T. Nakamura, M. Mishra, S. Tedeschi, Y. Chai, J. T. Stillerman, F. Friedrich, P. Yadav, T. Laud, V. M. Chien, T. Y. Zhuo *et al.*, “Auroram: The first open source multilingual language model red-teamed according to the us executive order,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.00399*, 2024.