

# Speech Translation Refinement using Large Language Models

Huaxia Dou, Xinyu Tian, Xinglin Lyu, Jie Zhu, Junhui Li, Lifan Guo

**Abstract**—Recent advancements in large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated their remarkable capabilities across various language tasks. Inspired by the success of text-to-text translation refinement, this paper investigates how LLMs can improve the performance of speech translation by introducing a joint refinement process. Through the joint refinement of speech translation (ST) and automatic speech recognition (ASR) transcription via LLMs, the performance of the ST model is significantly improved in both training-free in-context learning and parameter-efficient fine-tuning scenarios. Additionally, we explore the effect of document-level context on refinement under the context-aware fine-tuning scenario. Experimental results on the MuST-C and CoVoST 2 datasets, which include seven translation tasks, demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed approach using several popular LLMs including GPT-3.5-turbo, LLaMA3-8B, and Mistral-12B. Further analysis further suggests that jointly refining both transcription and translation yields better performance compared to refining translation alone. Meanwhile, incorporating document-level context significantly enhances refinement performance. We release our code and datasets on GitHub<sup>1</sup>.

**Index Terms**—speech translation refinement, joint refinement, large language model.

## I. INTRODUCTION

**S**PEECH-to-text translation (ST) refers to the process of converting the audio of a source language into written text in a target language. Despite impressive progress in ST, the performance of ST models based on either the cascade [1, 2, 3] or end-to-end [4, 5, 6] frameworks still significantly lags behind that of text-to-text translation models, leaving much room for improvement. Meanwhile, recent studies in text-to-text translation have shown that applying post-editing refinement via large language models (LLMs) can greatly improve the fluency and naturalness of the final translation. For example, Chen et al. [7] propose iterative prompts to enable an LLM to self-correct translations while Raunak et al. [8] introduce the intermediate reasoning chain before generating the refinement. Inspired by these advancements, this paper explores enhancing the performance of an ST model by introducing LLM-based refinement.

Unlike studies in text-to-text translation refinement that take clean source text as input, this paper addresses the challenge of refining speech translation where the source text, produced

Huaxia Dou, Xinyu Tian, Xinglin Lyu, and Junhui Li are with the School of Computer Science and Technology, Soochow University, Suzhou, China (e-mail: {20225227069, xytian, xllv2020}@stu.suda.edu.cn; lijunhui@suda.edu.cn)

Jie Zhu and Lifan Guo are with the Alibaba Cloud Computing, Hangzhou, China (e-mail: zhujie951121@gmail.com; lifan.lg@alibaba-inc.com)

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/world1tree/SpeechTranslationRefinement>

Auto Transcription:	I looked at his <u>throat</u> ; it was a little bit <b>painted</b> .
Auto Translation:	Ich sah mir seinen <b>Hals an</b> , er war ein bisschen <u>pink</u> .
Gold Transcription:	I looked at his <u>throat</u> , it was a little bit <u>pink</u> .
Gold Translation:	Ich schaute in den <u>Rachen</u> und es war ein klein wenig <u>pink</u> .

Fig. 1. Illustration of automatic transcription and translation from ASR and ST models. In this example, errors (**Bold** text) in both the automatic transcription and translation can be potentially corrected mutually.

by automatic speech recognition (ASR), contains inevitable errors. Fortunately, even with these errors, the transcription (i.e., ASR output) and the translation (i.e., ST output) can often help correct each other. As shown in Figure 1, the error *Hals an* in the automatic translation can be corrected by consulting the ASR transcription, which accurately recognizes it as *throat*. Therefore, we propose a joint refinement approach to enhance ST model performance by refining both ASR and ST outputs simultaneously.

Furthermore, this paper proposes applying LLM-based ST refinement in three scenarios: in-context learning, context-agnostic fine-tuning, and context-aware fine-tuning.<sup>2</sup> Regarding in-context learning, a dedicated prompt design featuring task descriptions with examples that demonstrate the task. For context-agnostic fine-tuning, LLMs used for refinement can be fine-tuned using parameter-efficient fine-tuning methods like LoRA [9]. In context-aware fine-tuning, we aim to improve the LLMs' robustness to ASR and ST errors by incorporating document-level context. To evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed approach, we conduct extensive experiments on the MuST-C and CoVoST 2 datasets. Several representative LLMs are examined, including GPT-3.5-turbo [10] for the in-context learning scenario, as well as LLaMA3-8B [11] and Mistral-12B [12] for both fine-tuning scenarios. Experimental results demonstrate that refining both translation and transcription together achieves better performance compared to refining translation alone. Additionally, incorporating document-level context into refinement can further improve performance. For instance, under the context-aware fine-tuning scenario, Mistral-12B achieves an absolute improvement of 2.98 to 4.22 in BLEU and 0.0450 to 0.0625 in COMET on the MuST-C dataset.

Overall, the main contributions of this paper can be sum-

<sup>2</sup>In this paper, *context-agnostic* refers to not incorporating document-level (i.e., inter-sentence) context, while *context-aware* refers to modeling document-level context.

marized as follows:

- We propose a novel approach to enhance ST model performance by introducing joint LLM-based refinement for both ASR and ST outputs. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first exploration in the ST research field.<sup>3</sup>
- We adopt the proposed LLM-based refinement across several scenarios, including in-context learning, context-agnostic fine-tuning, and context-aware fine-tuning, to improve the performance of state-of-the-art ST models.
- We verify the effectiveness of the proposed approach across a wide range of ST tasks, including several translation directions, using several popular LLMs such as GPT-3.5-turbo, LLaMA3-8B and Mistral-12B.

## II. RELATED WORK

**Speech-to-Text Translation.** Traditional speech-to-text Translation (ST) systems are typically implemented via a cascade of speech recognition and text translation stages [1, 2, 3], which might incur high latency and error propagation. By contrast, the end-to-end framework has received much attention as it requires no intermediate steps. Existing studies in this line usually utilize the strengths of text translation to enhance ST within a multi-task framework [4]. Techniques such as pre-training [14, 15, 16, 17], data augmentation [18, 19, 20], contrastive learning [21, 22, 23], sequence mixup [5, 24, 25, 26], knowledge distillation [6, 27], and regularization [28, 29] are widely employed to boost the performance of ST systems. With the rise of LLMs, recent studies have explored combining speech foundation models with LLMs for speech translation [30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35]. Gaido et al. [36] outlines the typical process, which consists of five components: a speech foundation model for extracting high-level speech representations, a length adapter for compressing speech features, a modality adapter for embedding space mapping, a prompt-speech merger for combining speech, and text prompts and a LLM for generating translation. Hu et al. [37] proposes a new generative paradigm for translation tasks, which harnesses the rich information embedded in diverse N-best hypotheses through the use of LLMs to generate higher-quality translation results.

**Text-to-Text Translation Refinement.** Translation refinement (post-editing) aims to edit the output of MT to produce better translation results. Due to data scarcity, traditional automatic post-editing (APE) relies on manual annotations or large amounts of synthetic data [38, 39]. Recent research indicates that prompting LLMs for APE — particularly prompt-based approaches — can reduce the need for large volumes of training data. Chen et al. [7] refine translations iteratively with GPT-3.5, which reduces BLEU and chrF++ scores but result in similar or higher COMET scores. Raunak et al. [8] refine translations in both Chain of Thought (COT) and non-COT scenarios. Feng et al. [40] propose an LLM-based self-refinement translation framework to improve translation

quality across a wide range of languages. To achieve better APE performance, some studies also fine-tune LLMs using supervised data. Ki and Carpuat [41] leverage LLMs to automatically post-edit translation using feedbacks. Koneru et al. [42] show that fine-tuning LLMs for APE can lead to significant improvements in both sentence and document-level metrics while also generalizing well to out-of-domain data. Inspired by success in text-to-text translation refinement, this paper explores speech translation refinement, a topic that has not been explored before. Specifically, we propose a joint refinement approach that simultaneously addresses errors in both translation and transcription outputs. Similar to the aforementioned translation refinement methods, our approach introduces some latency. However, it is important to emphasize that this latency is accompanied by significant improvements in speech translation quality after refinement.

## III. APPROACH

We first describe the task of joint refinement for translation and transcription in Section III-A. Then we detail our approach to joint refinement in the in-context learning scenario in Section III-B, followed by our approaches to joint refinement in both fine-tuning scenarios in Section III-C.

### A. Joint Refinement for Translation and Transcription

We introduce the task of joint refinement for translation and transcription, denoted as  $\text{Refine}_{Both}$ . This task aims to refine both a source-side transcription  $A$  (i.e., ASR output) and a target-side translation  $S$  (i.e., ST output) by generating an improved transcription  $A'$  and an improved translation  $S'$ , i.e.,  $(A, S) \rightarrow (A', S')$ . Note that during the generation,  $A'$  is predicted first, followed by  $S'$ . This allows the improved transcription  $A'$  to be used for generating  $S'$ .

The detailed pipeline for joint refinement with LLMs is shown in Figure 2. It starts with the source input speech, which is encoded using a pre-trained speech recognition model such as HuBERT [43] or Whisper [44]. The ASR model then generates a transcription  $A$  while the ST model produces a translation  $S$ . In the  $\text{Refine}_{Both}$  task, we construct a prompt using the transcription  $A$ , the translation  $S$ , and the retrieved examples. We then request the LLM to generate an output that includes both a refined transcription and a refined translation.

a) *Two Contrasting Tasks:* To better illustrate the effects of joint refinement, we compare  $\text{Refine}_{Both}$  with two contrasting tasks:

- $\text{Refine}_{ST}$ : This task focuses solely on refining the translation by generating an improved translation  $S'$ , i.e.,  $(A, S) \rightarrow (S')$ . It improves the translation without taking into account potential errors in the transcription  $A$ .
- $\text{Paraphrase}_{ST}$ : This task refines the translation without using the ASR transcription, i.e.,  $(S) \rightarrow (S')$ . Similar to Chen et al. [7], this task serves as a contrasting experiment to translation prompting.

In the following sections, we use  $\text{Refine}_{Both}$  to demonstrate the proposed in-context learning and task-specific fine-tuning processes. It is important to note that similar in-context learning and fine-tuning approaches can be applied to  $\text{Refine}_{ST}$  and  $\text{Paraphrase}_{ST}$  as well.

<sup>3</sup>Koneru et al. [13] also explore speech translation refinement, but differs in that they focus on refining ASR and ST separately, whereas our approach jointly refines both tasks. Additionally, we explore both in-context learning and fine-tuning scenarios, extending the analysis to include document-level context.




Fig. 2. Pipeline for the joint refinement.  $\text{Refine}_{\text{Both}}$  is on the right part of the pipeline (highlighted in gray).




Fig. 3. Prompts for ST refinement using LLMs, including instruction, optional in-context examples (used only for in-context learning), and query. The placeholders " $\langle \text{var} \rangle$ " are replaced with their corresponding content. See Appendix B for detailed examples.

## B. Joint Refining via In-Context Learning

As shown in Figure 3, a prompt consists of three main parts: *instruction*, *in-context examples*, and *query*.

*Instruction* provides a brief definition of joint refinement and specifies constraints on the output format. *In-context examples* provide additional context to enhance performance. Each example includes an automatic transcription and translation, along with their corresponding refined versions. While these examples provide guidance on what to generate, the number of examples that can be included is constrained by the context length. To select  $M$  demonstration examples from the training set, we compare two strategies: one selects examples randomly, while the other selects examples based on the L2 distance between a candidate pair  $(\hat{A}, \hat{S})$  and the input pair  $(A, S)$ . Finally, the *query* prompts the LLMs with the question by specifying the automatic transcription

and translation as input parameters. The basic form of the prompt is the concatenation of an *instruction*, optional *in-context examples*, and a *query*.

## C. Joint Refining via Fine-Tuning

We first present our context-agnostic fine-tuning, which assumes that both the transcription  $A$  and the translation  $S$  are at the sentence level (Section III-C1). Then we extend it to context-aware fine-tuning by expanding the scope from a single sentence to multiple sentences (Section III-C2).

1) *Context-Agnostic Fine-Tuning*: Fine-tuning is effective when only a small amount of training data is available for supervised LLM training. To optimize the refinement capabilities of LLMs, we adopt a two-stage strategy.

- Stage 1: Inspired by Gururangan et al. [45], we establish the intrinsic connection between the source-side




Fig. 4. Prompt used in the first stage of fine-tuning.

TABLE I  
STATISTICS OF ALL DATASETS IN OUR EXPERIMENTS.

En→	#Sentences			#Documents		
	Training	Valid	Test	Training	Valid	Test
<b>MuST-C</b>						
<b>De</b>	225 271	1418	2641	2041	11	27
<b>Fr</b>	269 248	1408	2632	2458	11	27
<b>Es</b>	260 041	1312	2502	2512	11	27
<b>CoVoST 2</b>						
<b>De</b>	289 408	15 520	15 518	-	-	-
<b>Ca</b>	289 408	15 520	15 519	-	-	-
<b>Ar</b>	289 408	15 520	15 519	-	-	-
<b>Tr</b>	289 408	15 520	15 519	-	-	-

transcription and target-side translation by fine-tuning LLMs to generate both the source-side transcription  $A$  and the target-side translation  $S$ . Figure 4 demonstrates the prompt and its output response for this stage.

- Stage 2: In this stage, we continue to fine-tune LLMs using the prompt shown in Figure 3, with the output response including both refined transcription and translation. Note that no in-context examples are used during the fine-tuning process.

2) *Context-Aware Fine-Tuning*: While document-level context has demonstrated benefits for both textual and speech translation [46, 47, 48], its effectiveness in translation refinement has not been well explored. To address this gap, we examine the use of document-level context through a simple concatenation-based strategy, which expands the scope of the text to be refined from single sentences to multiple sentences. Specifically, in this setting, both the source-side transcription  $A$  and target-side translation  $S$  consist of  $K$  neighboring sentences, as do their refined counterparts  $A'$  and  $S'$ . The prompts and output responses during the two-stage fine-tuning process remain consistent with those used in context-agnostic fine-tuning.

During the inference phase, we use chunk-based decoding (CBD) [48], which splits all sentences in a document into non-overlapping chunks, with each chunk concatenating  $K$  neighboring sentences. CBD is efficient because it encodes and decodes each sentence only once. To address potential misalignment issues, where the number of output sentences may differ from the number of input sentences, we prepend an index to each sentence, starting from 1 (e.g., `#1 ... #2 ... #3 ...` when  $K$  is set to 3).<sup>4</sup>

## IV. EXPERIMENTATION

### A. Experimental Setup

a) *Datasets*: We build the refinement datasets from MuST-C [49] and CoVoST 2 [50]. Specifically, we obtain the corresponding automatic transcription and translation on MuST-C and CoVoST 2 by running ASR and ST models. MuST-C, including English (EN) to {German (DE), French (FR), Spanish (ES)} three translation directions, is derived from TED talks and provides document-level annotation. Therefore, it can be used for evaluation under the context-aware fine-tuning scenario. In contrast, CoVoST 2 provides only the sentence-level annotation on four translation tasks, including English (EN) to {German (DE), Catalan (CA), Arabic (AR), Turkish (TR)}. See Table I for details of data splitting and dataset statistics.

b) *Models*: We build our approach on three popular LLMs: GPT-3.5-turbo, LLaMA3-8B<sup>5</sup>, and Mistral-12B<sup>6</sup>. GPT-3.5-turbo is renowned for its state-of-the-art performance in in-context learning without the need for parameter fine-tuning. LLaMA3-8B and Mistral-12B are chosen for their popularity as open-source models that can be customized for local fine-tuning.

We employ the best-performing open-source ST models to generate automatic speech translation. Among them, CRESS [51] is the top performer on the MuST-C dataset, while SpeechLM-P [52] excels on CoVoST 2. Specifically, we use the CRESS model with ASR capability<sup>7</sup> to generate the automatic translation and transcription on MuST-C. We employ SpeechLM-P to generate automatic speech translation on CoVoST 2. Automatic ASR transcriptions for CoVoST 2 are generated using the `whisper-large-v3` [44] model.

c) *Training and Inference*: For in-context learning without training, we first use the SentenceTransformers library<sup>8</sup> to obtain the sentence embeddings  $E_A$  and  $E_S$  for transcription  $A$  and translation  $S$ . We then concatenate  $[E_A, E_S]$  to retrieve examples from the training set and perform inference by concatenating the prompt with the retrieval examples.

For fine-tuning, we use the Llama-Factory [53] framework, setting the LoRA rank to 8 and the scaling parameter to 16. All models are fine-tuned on 2 Nvidia Tesla V100 GPUs with a batch size of 2, gradient accumulation over 16 steps, and a learning rate of  $1e-4$  for 2 epochs. We then use the checkpoint with the best performance on the validation set to run the inference with a beam size of 3.

d) *Metrics*: For performance evaluation, we report SacreBLEU<sup>9</sup> [54] and COMET<sup>10</sup> [55] for ST refinement, and WER<sup>11</sup> for transcription refinement.

<sup>4</sup>In rare cases of misaligned refinement, we use the original input sentences as the refined result.

<sup>5</sup><https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Meta-Llama-3-8B-Instruct>

<sup>6</sup><https://huggingface.co/mistralai/Mistral-Nemo-Instruct-2407>

<sup>7</sup>We follow the approach in XSTNeT [4] to train it from scratch.

<sup>8</sup>`paraphrase-multilingual-mpnet-base-v2`: <https://www.sbert.net/index.html>

<sup>9</sup>SacreBLEU signature: `nrefs:1 | bs:1000 | seed:12345 | case:mixed | eff:no | tok:13a | smooth:exp | version:2.0.0`

<sup>10</sup>Unbabel/wmt22-comet-da

<sup>11</sup>WER is case-sensitive and includes punctuation removal.

TABLE II  
EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS ON MUST-C DATASET FOR TRANSLATION REFINEMENT (MEASURED BY BLEU AND COMET) AND TRANSCRIPTION REFINEMENT (MEASURED BY WER).

Task	Model	En→De			En→Fr			En→Es		
		BLEU↑	COMET↑	WER↓	BLEU↑	COMET↑	WER↓	BLEU↑	COMET↑	WER↓
-	CRESS (F&F)	29.40	-	-	40.10	-	-	33.20	-	-
	CRESS (Ours)	29.40	.7669	10.65	40.00	.7814	10.23	33.10	.7805	10.47
<b>In-Context Learning</b>										
Refine <sub>Both</sub>	GPT-3.5 (0)	30.17	<b>.8147</b>	12.67	40.22	<b>.8171</b>	12.42	34.12	<b>.8179</b>	13.21
	GPT-3.5 (R1)	<b>30.52</b>	.8124	10.59	<b>40.99</b>	.8158	9.95	34.03	.8138	10.77
	GPT-3.5 (R3)	30.38	.8118	10.31	40.59	.8168	<b>9.60</b>	<b>34.36</b>	.8154	10.29
	GPT-3.5 (R5)	30.46	.8134	10.29	40.67	.8156	9.84	34.20	.8156	10.02
	GPT-3.5 (T1)	30.15	.8101	10.82	40.85	.8137	10.01	34.02	.8139	10.72
	GPT-3.5 (T3)	30.09	.8108	10.28	40.65	.8161	9.66	34.20	.8148	10.02
	GPT-3.5 (T5)	30.41	.8119	<b>10.26</b>	40.48	.8157	9.71	<b>34.36</b>	.8153	<b>9.89</b>
Refine <sub>ST</sub>	GPT-3.5 (0)	27.00	.8045	-	35.53	.8092	-	32.12	.8131	-
	GPT-3.5 (R1)	28.95	.8107	-	38.41	.8142	-	33.89	.8147	-
	GPT-3.5 (R3)	28.85	.8121	-	38.20	.8156	-	<b>34.16</b>	<b>.8184</b>	-
	GPT-3.5 (R5)	28.98	<b>.8134</b>	-	38.61	<b>.8171</b>	-	34.14	.8174	-
	GPT-3.5 (T1)	28.69	.8088	-	38.33	.8118	-	33.68	.8121	-
	GPT-3.5 (T3)	28.68	.8110	-	38.12	.8111	-	33.64	.8147	-
	GPT-3.5 (T5)	<b>29.04</b>	.8099	-	<b>38.62</b>	.8150	-	34.04	.8156	-
Paraphrase <sub>ST</sub>	GPT-3.5 (0)	12.02	.7579	-	13.91	.7488	-	14.27	.7585	-
	GPT-3.5 (T1)	19.38	.7735	-	24.38	.7714	-	22.64	.7758	-
	GPT-3.5 (T3)	22.65	.7821	-	29.04	.7843	-	26.37	.7862	-
	GPT-3.5 (T5)	<b>24.97</b>	<b>.7848</b>	-	<b>31.78</b>	<b>.7860</b>	-	<b>28.74</b>	<b>.7918</b>	-
<b>Context-Agnostic Fine-Tuning</b>										
Refine <sub>Both</sub>	LLaMA3-8B	32.04	.8196	<b>9.27</b>	42.16	.8202	9.03	34.99	.8142	9.37
	Mistral-12B	<b>32.75</b>	<b>.8216</b>	9.29	<b>43.59</b>	<b>.8258</b>	<b>8.96</b>	<b>35.79</b>	<b>.8189</b>	<b>9.13</b>
Refine <sub>ST</sub>	LLaMA3-8B	29.92	.8189	-	41.48	.8212	-	<b>34.59</b>	.8195	-
	Mistral-12B	<b>30.25</b>	<b>.8225</b>	-	<b>42.61</b>	<b>.8246</b>	-	34.52	<b>.8223</b>	-
Paraphrase <sub>ST</sub>	LLaMA3-8B	28.48	.7975	-	40.87	.8024	-	<b>34.30</b>	.8010	-
	Mistral-12B	<b>30.11</b>	<b>.8059</b>	-	<b>41.11</b>	<b>.8076</b>	-	33.74	<b>.8074</b>	-
<b>Context-Aware Fine-Tuning (K = 3)</b>										
Refine <sub>Both</sub>	LLaMA3-8B	32.43	.8240	8.95	42.93	.8263	8.79	35.62	.8241	9.20
	Mistral-12B	<b>33.39</b>	<b>.8294</b>	<b>8.91</b>	<b>44.22</b>	<b>.8293</b>	<b>8.43</b>	<b>36.08</b>	<b>.8255</b>	<b>8.88</b>
Refine <sub>ST</sub>	LLaMA3-8B	32.2	.8217	-	42.49	.8262	-	34.18	.8224	-
	Mistral-12B	<b>32.6</b>	<b>.8288</b>	-	<b>43.49</b>	<b>.8314</b>	-	<b>35.71</b>	<b>.8259</b>	-
Paraphrase <sub>ST</sub>	LLaMA3-8B	30.29	.8025	-	41.34	.8070	-	34.36	.8048	-
	Mistral-12B	<b>31.07</b>	<b>.8122</b>	-	<b>42.30</b>	<b>.8154</b>	-	<b>34.80</b>	<b>.8112</b>	-

Note: Here, GPT-3.5 (0) represents zero-shot in-context learning, while GPT-3.5 (R<sub>i</sub>) and GPT-3.5 (T<sub>i</sub>) denote the use of *i* random or top closest examples for few-shot in-context learning.

TABLE III  
EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS ON THE CoVoST 2 DATASET.

Task	Model	En→De			En→Ca			En→Ar			En→Tr		
		BLEU↑	COMET↑	WER↓	BLEU↑	COMET↑	WER↓	BLEU↑	COMET↑	WER↓	BLEU↑	COMET↑	WER↓
-	SpeechLM-P / Whisper	27.58	.7579	11.09	35.89	.7751	11.09	21.72	.7954	11.09	19.54	.8007	11.09
<b>Context-Agnostic Fine-Tuning</b>													
Refine <sub>Both</sub>	LLaMA3-8B	31.24	.8230	9.16	39.62	.8163	9.07	23.62	.8189	9.03	22.28	<b>.8366</b>	9.25
	Mistral-12B	<b>32.39</b>	<b>.8334</b>	<b>9.11</b>	<b>39.99</b>	<b>.8165</b>	<b>8.90</b>	<b>24.04</b>	<b>.8239</b>	<b>8.93</b>	<b>22.35</b>	.8358	<b>9.16</b>
Refine <sub>ST</sub>	LLaMA3-8B	30.02	.8021	-	38.21	.8005	-	22.82	.8103	-	<b>21.92</b>	<b>.8305</b>	-
	Mistral-12B	<b>30.51</b>	<b>.8108</b>	-	<b>39.08</b>	<b>.8075</b>	-	<b>23.48</b>	<b>.8183</b>	-	21.87	.8286	-
Paraphrase <sub>ST</sub>	LLaMA3-8B	28.43	.7754	-	36.72	.7823	-	21.95	.7981	-	20.19	<b>.8067</b>	-
	Mistral-12B	<b>28.93</b>	<b>.7859</b>	-	<b>36.87</b>	.7814	-	<b>22.10</b>	<b>.8003</b>	-	<b>20.22</b>	.8062	-

Note: We present the performance of in-context learning settings in Appendix A.

## B. Experimental Results on MuST-C

Table II compares the performance on MuST-C dataset. The first two rows show that when preparing automatic transcription and translation, we achieve similar ST performance in BLEU as Fang et al. [5]. Next let us focus on the Refine<sub>Both</sub> task and answer the following Q1 to Q3 questions.

**Q1: Does in-context learning improve performance?** Compared to the input CRESS (Ours), in-context learning with GPT-3.5-turbo improves ST refinement, as evidenced by

higher BLEU and COMET scores across all three language pairs. However, zero-shot in-context learning significantly degrades transcription refinement performance, whereas few-shot learning has a more modest effect. Additionally, there is no clear benefit of using more in-context examples or whether retrieval-based example selection surpasses random selection.

**Q2: Does context-agnostic fine-tuning improve performance?** Yes, context-agnostic fine-tuning enhances performance for both ST and transcription refinement across all three

language pairs. For instance, the fine-tuned Mistral-12B shows an absolute improvement of 3.35, 3.59, and 2.69 in BLEU scores, and 0.0547, 0.0444, and 0.0384 in COMET scores for En→De, En→Fr, and En→Es translation refinement, respectively. Additionally, it achieves improvements of 1.36, 1.27, and 1.34 in WER for transcription refinement. Despite having fewer parameters, the fine-tuned LLaMA3-8B and Mistral-12B models outperform GPT-3.5-turbo.

**Q3: Does context improve performance?** Yes, incorporating document-level context enhances performance for both ST and transcription refinement. For instance, expanding refinement from a single sentence to three sentences (i.e.,  $K = 3$ ) allows Mistral-12B to achieve additional improvements of 0.64, 0.63, and 0.29 in BLEU scores, and 0.0078, 0.0035, and 0.0066 in COMET scores for En→De, En→Fr, and En→Es translation, respectively.

Then, we evaluate the  $\text{Refine}_{ST}$  and  $\text{Paraphrase}_{ST}$  tasks, focusing on questions Q4 and Q5.

**Q4: How do  $\text{Refine}_{ST}$  and  $\text{Paraphrase}_{ST}$  perform?** Compared to the input  $\text{CRESS}$  (*Ours*),  $\text{Refine}_{ST}$  consistently achieves higher COMET scores across all language pairs and in both in-context learning and fine-tuning settings. However, it negatively affects BLEU scores for En→De and En→Fr translations in the in-context learning setting. This pattern, where GPT-3.5-turbo achieves lower BLEU scores but higher COMET scores, aligns with Chen et al. [7]. In contrast,  $\text{Paraphrase}_{ST}$  in the in-context learning setting leads to significant BLEU score declines, indicating the importance of using transcription input to avoid semantic drift. Fortunately,  $\text{Paraphrase}_{ST}$  performs comparably or even better in both context-agnostic and context-aware fine-tuning.

**Q5: Does joint performing transcription help translation refinement?** Comparing  $\text{Refine}_{Both}$  with  $\text{Refine}_{ST}$  reveals that joint performing transcription results in higher BLEU scores (with all improvements statistically significant at  $p < 0.01$  [56]), although the COMET scores remain similar. For instance, when context-aware fine-tuning the Mistral-12B,  $\text{Refine}_{Both}$  achieves BLEU scores that are 2.50, 0.98, and 1.27 points higher than  $\text{Refine}_{ST}$  for En→De, En→Fr, and En→Es ST refinement, respectively.

### C. Experimental Results on CoVoST 2

Table III shows the performance results on the CoVoST 2 dataset. It is evident that fine-tuning improves performance for both speech translation (ST) and transcription refinement across all four language pairs. Specifically, for the  $\text{Refine}_{Both}$  task, fine-tuning Mistral-12B results in absolute BLEU score improvements of 4.81, 4.10, 2.32, and 2.81, and COMET score improvements of 0.0755, 0.0414, 0.0285, and 0.0351 for En→De, En→Ca, En→Ar, and En→Tr, respectively. Additionally, it clearly shows that  $\text{Refine}_{Both}$  achieves the best result cross the four language pairs, followed by  $\text{Refine}_{ST}$  and then  $\text{Paraphrase}_{ST}$ .

## V. ANALYSIS

In this section, we use MuST-C En→De as a representative example to demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach, unless stated otherwise. Specifically, Section V-A, V-F, and V-H

TABLE IV  
SEMANTIC AND FLUENCY EVALUATION RESULTS ON THE MUST-C  
EN→DE TEST SET.

Refinement	Transcription			Translation		
	BERT-S↑	PPL↓	COH↑	BERT-S↑	PPL↓	COH↑
Before	97.51	45.66	48.49	85.66	50.99	67.39
After	<b>98.00</b>	<b>35.75</b>	<b>48.93</b>	<b>86.42</b>	<b>50.28</b>	<b>67.66</b>

Note: The first row displays the performance before refinement, while the second row shows the performance after refinement.

show that our approach outperforms others from multiple perspectives. Section V-B, V-C, and V-G compare the performance across different settings. Finally, Section V-D and V-E provide further insights into the importance of document-level context for context-aware fine-tuning.

### A. Improvements in Semantics and Fluency

To examine whether the observed improvements are reflected in both semantic and fluency aspects, we evaluate both the transcription and translation outputs before and after the refinement process. For semantic evaluation, we use BERTScore (BERT-S)<sup>12</sup> [57] as the prime metric. To assess fluency, we use Perplexity (PPL) and Coherence (COH) [58] as the metrics. Specifically, we calculate perplexity scores with the GPT-2 [59] model and coherence scores with the SimCSE [60] model. The results, as presented in Table IV, indicate improvements in both semantic accuracy and fluency. These findings suggest that the refinements enhance not only the fluency of the text but also its underlying semantic meaning.

### B. Effect of ASR Transcription Quality

The source sentences for  $\text{Refine}_{Both}$  are derived from noisy ASR outputs. To analyze the impact of ASR transcription quality, we use the context-agnostic fine-tuned LLaMA3-8B model. We generate noisy transcriptions with varying levels of WER using several off-the-shelf Whisper models, ranging from tiny to large [44]. For comparison, we also include gold transcriptions, which represent the ideal case (i.e., Oracle with a 0.00 WER score). Table V shows the performance across different ASR transcription qualities. As the quality of the ASR transcription improves, both translation and transcription refinement performance steadily improves as well. The model achieves the best results with gold transcriptions, likely due to the reduced noise, which allows for more accurate error detection and correction.

### C. Effect of Two-Stage Fine-Tuning

To validate the effectiveness of the two-stage strategy, we compare models fine-tuned with Stage 2 ( $S_2$ ) alone to those fine-tuned with both Stage 1 and Stage 2 ( $S_1 + S_2$ ). As shown in Table VI, the two-stage fine-tuning strategy consistently outperforms fine-tuning with Stage 2 alone in terms of BLEU scores for both LLaMA3-8B and Mistral-12B. Additionally, the two-stage strategy generally leads to modest improvements in COMET and WER scores.

<sup>12</sup>bert-base-multilingual-cased\_L9\_no-idx\_version=0.3.12(hug\_trans=4.44.1)\_fast-tokenizer

TABLE V  
PERFORMANCE ON MUST-C EN→DE TEST SET WITH DIFFERENT ASR  
TRANSCRIPTION QUALITIES.

Whisper	WER $\diamond$ ↓	BLEU $\uparrow$	COMET $\uparrow$	WER $\downarrow$
-	-	29.40*	.7669*	-
Tiny	13.50	31.50	.8185	10.51
Base	11.22	32.11	.8269	8.88
Small	9.59	32.53	.8311	7.68
Medium	8.95	32.87	.8338	7.13
Large	8.22	32.93	.8360	6.63
Oracle	<b>0.00</b>	<b>34.30</b>	<b>.8535</b>	<b>1.20</b>

Note:  $\diamond$  and \* indicate ASR/ST performance before refinement, respectively.

TABLE VI  
PERFORMANCE ON MUST-C EN→DE TEST SET WITH SINGLE ( $S_2$ ) OR  
TWO-STAGE ( $S_1 + S_2$ ) FINE-TUNING STRATEGIES.

Model	Stage	BLEU $\uparrow$	COMET $\uparrow$	WER $\downarrow$
<b>Context-Agnostic Fine-Tuning</b>				
LLaMA3-8B	$S_2$	31.31	.8172	9.44
	$S_1 + S_2$	<b>32.04</b>	<b>.8196</b>	<b>9.27</b>
Mistral-12B	$S_2$	32.40	<b>.8216</b>	9.32
	$S_1 + S_2$	<b>32.75</b>	<b>.8216</b>	<b>9.29</b>
<b>Context-Aware Fine-Tuning (<math>K = 3</math>)</b>				
LLaMA3-8B	$S_2$	32.05	.8213	9.06
	$S_1 + S_2$	<b>32.43</b>	<b>.8240</b>	<b>8.95</b>
Mistral-12B	$S_2$	33.00	.8284	<b>8.90</b>
	$S_1 + S_2$	<b>33.39</b>	<b>.8294</b>	8.91

TABLE VII  
PERFORMANCE ON MUST-C EN→DE VALIDATION SET WITH DIFFERENT  
CONTEXT LENGTH.

$K$	BLEU $\uparrow$	COMET $\uparrow$	WER $\downarrow$
1	30.29	.8059	10.69
3	<b>31.76</b>	<b>.8117</b>	<b>10.09</b>
5	31.75	.8094	10.94
7	31.30	.8050	10.24
9	31.55	.8065	10.84

Note: When  $K$  is set to 1, the model becomes context-agnostic, as it does not incorporate neighboring sentences.

#### D. Effect of Context Length

In this analysis, we investigate the impact of varying document-level context length on context-aware fine-tuning. We evaluate the performance of the LLaMA3-8B model across different sentence counts,  $K \in \{1, 3, 5, 7, 9\}$ . As shown in Table VII, incorporating document-level context results in better performance compared to the absence of it (i.e.,  $K = 1$  for context-agnostic). The model achieves its best results when  $K = 3$ . Notably, increasing the context length beyond  $K = 3$  does not result in further performance improvements. Based on these findings, we select  $K = 3$  for all context-aware experiments, as it offers the best balance between performance gains and computational efficiency.

#### E. Analysis of Context Sensibility

In Section III-C2, we use chunk-based decoding (CBD) for context-aware inference. To verify whether context-aware fine-tuning truly takes advantage of contextual information, we

TABLE VIII  
PERFORMANCE ON MUST-C EN→DE TEST SET WITH DIFFERENT  
DOCUMENT-LEVEL CONTEXT.

Shuffle	BLEU $\uparrow$	COMET $\uparrow$	APT $\uparrow$	WER $\downarrow$
-	<b>32.43</b>	<b>.8240</b>	<b>68.58</b>	<b>8.95</b>
Local	31.70	.8162	68.16	9.43
Global	31.26	.8145	67.79	9.69

Score the following translation from  $\langle src\_lang \rangle$  to  $\langle tgt\_lang \rangle$  with respect to the human reference on a continuous scale from 0 to 100, where a score of zero means “no meaning preserved” and score of one hundred means “perfect meaning and grammar”. Just provide a score, no explanation needed.  
 $\langle src\_lang \rangle$  source:  $\langle A' \rangle$   
 $\langle tgt\_lang \rangle$  human reference:  $\langle S' \rangle$   
 $\langle tgt\_lang \rangle$  translation:  $\langle S \rangle$   
 Score:

Fig. 5. Prompt for GPT evaluation.

follow Sun et al. [61] by deliberately introducing incorrect context. Specifically, we begin by shuffling the sentence order within each document and then reassembling it using CBD, which we term *Local Shuffle*, and then, by swapping sentences between documents, which we refer to as *Global Shuffle*. The underlying intuition is that if the model is not sensitive to discourse dependencies, we would expect its performance to remain relatively unaffected by these context shuffling manipulations. To test this hypothesis, we conduct experiments using the LLaMA3-8B model and include the APT metric [62] to evaluate pronoun translation accuracy. As shown in Table VIII, the results clearly indicate that randomizing context—whether by shuffling sentences within the same document or across different documents—leads to a noticeable decline in performance. Furthermore, using context from different documents (i.e., *Global Shuffle*) results in a more significant performance degradation than shuffling within the same document (i.e., *Local Shuffle*). These findings suggest that the model does indeed effectively modeling document-level context, highlighting the importance of preserving discourse dependencies in context-aware fine-tuning.

#### F. GPT Evaluation

Based on the *Direct Assessment* prompt from Kocmi and Federmann [63], as shown in Figure 5, we use GPT-4o to evaluate speech translation quality on a 0-100 scale for both the initial and refined translations. Our in-house dataset consists of 200 randomly selected samples from  $Refine_{Both}$  task of Mistral-12B under sentence-level fine-tuning setting. As shown in Table IX, for the seven language pairs in the MuST-C and CoVoST 2 datasets, GPT-4o consistently assign higher evaluation scores to the refined translations compared to the initial ones. This improvement is particularly notable for En→De and En→Ca translation refinement, with score increases of 10.24 and 9.05, respectively. These results align

TABLE IX  
AVERAGE GPT SCORE FOR SPEECH TRANSLATION QUALITY.

Refinement	MuST-C			CoVoST 2			
	En→De	En→Fr	En→Es	En→De	En→Ca	En→Ar	En→Tr
Before	73.58	78.89	76.82	69.00	71.83	73.38	70.15
After	<b>78.92</b>	<b>82.83</b>	<b>80.92</b>	<b>79.24</b>	<b>80.88</b>	<b>77.80</b>	<b>76.53</b>

Note: The first row displays the performance before refinement, while the second row shows the performance after refinement.

TABLE X  
EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS OF REFINING ST FROM CONST.

Task	Model	En→De			En→Fr			En→Es		
		BLEU↑	COMET↑	WER↓	BLEU↑	COMET↑	WER↓	BLEU↑	COMET↑	WER↓
	ConST	28.10	.7624	12.31	38.15	.7701	11.49	31.91	.7748	11.38
<b>Context-Agnostic Fine-Tuning</b>										
Refine <sub>Both</sub>	LLaMA3-8B	30.58	.8083	10.82	41.30	.8125	10.37	34.95	.8109	10.16
	Mistral-12B	<b>31.77</b>	<b>.8141</b>	<b>10.67</b>	<b>42.47</b>	<b>.8175</b>	<b>10.20</b>	<b>35.45</b>	<b>.8164</b>	<b>9.85</b>
Refine <sub>ST</sub>	LLaMA3-8B	29.23	.8081	-	38.74	.8114	-	33.56	.8137	-
	Mistral-12B	<b>30.14</b>	<b>.8154</b>	-	<b>41.51</b>	<b>.8196</b>	-	<b>34.91</b>	<b>.8184</b>	-
<b>Context-Aware Fine-Tuning (K = 3)</b>										
Refine <sub>Both</sub>	LLaMA3-8B	31.17	.8165	10.88	42.24	.8196	10.16	34.85	.8188	<b>9.91</b>
	Mistral-12B	<b>32.26</b>	<b>.8245</b>	<b>10.74</b>	<b>42.96</b>	<b>.8250</b>	<b>10.10</b>	<b>35.60</b>	<b>.8244</b>	10.15
Refine <sub>ST</sub>	LLaMA3-8B	30.65	.8153	-	41.03	.8190	-	34.16	.8196	-
	Mistral-12B	<b>31.06</b>	<b>.8234</b>	-	<b>42.86</b>	<b>.8234</b>	-	<b>34.55</b>	<b>.8232</b>	-

with other metrics (e.g. BLEU and COMET), which similarly indicate that the refined translations are superior to the initial ones. We will provide specific cases in Section V-H for further illustration.

### G. Refining Speech Translation from Different System

In Section IV, we refine speech translation (ST) using the MuST-C dataset with our implementation of CRESS [51], a state-of-the-art end-to-end ST system. To further demonstrate the robustness of our approach across different translation qualities, we also refine ST using ConST [21] in this section. Specifically, we first generate ASR and ST data for refinement by performing inference on the MuST-C `tst-COMMON` test set using the open-source ConST model<sup>13</sup>. As shown in Table X, for the Refine<sub>Both</sub> task without document-level context, Mistral-12B achieves significant improvements across several metrics. Specifically, it shows absolute increases of 3.67, 4.32, and 3.54 in BLEU scores, 0.0517, 0.0474, and 0.0416 in COMET scores, and 1.64, 1.29, and 1.53 in WER scores for En→De, En→Fr, and En→Es translation refinements, respectively. When document-level context is incorporated, Mistral-12B further achieves an additional improvement of 0.49, 0.49, and 0.15 in BLEU scores, and 0.1040, 0.0075, and 0.0080 in COMET scores for En→De, En→Fr, and En→Es translation refinement, respectively. As in Section IV-B, we observe that joint transcription (i.e., Refine<sub>Both</sub>) leads to higher BLEU scores and comparable COMET scores, along with an advantage of improving transcription compared to refining only ST (i.e., Refine<sub>ST</sub>). Overall, these results confirm that our model is capable of refining ST across a variety of translation qualities.

### H. Case Analysis

In this section, we provide a detailed comparison of specific cases before and after the refinement process. We examine three examples from the MuST-C En→De, using CRESS (Ours) and Mistral-12B in the Refine<sub>Both</sub> task, as shown in Table XI. These cases demonstrate how the refinement process improves both automatic speech recognition (ASR) and translation outputs.

- **Case 1:** In this example, the word “Mai” is incorrectly transcribed as “May” in the automatic transcription. By referring to the word “Mai” from the automatic translation, the refinement process updates the transcription to the correct word “Mai”. Similarly, the word “angerodneten” in the automatic translation is refined to “arrangierten” in the refined translation. This correction likely occurs by cross-referencing the correct English word “arranged” from either the automatic transcription or the refined translation.
- **Case 2:** In this example, the word “Intersexuelle” in the automatic translation helps to correct the erroneous transcription of “intersects” to the accurate term “intersex” in the refined transcription. Additionally, the phrase “dieforschung von Geschlechtsunterschieden” in the automatic translation contains two issues: the misspelled word “dieforschung” and the awkward use of “von”. By leveraging the automatic translation and the phrase “sex-difference research” from both the automatic and refined transcriptions, the word “dieforschung” is corrected to “die Forschung”, and “von” is replaced with “über”, resulting in a more natural and accurate expression.
- **Case 3:** In this example, the phrase “unsere ist” from the automatic translation is used to correct the transcription “as ours” to “is ours” in the refined transcription.

<sup>13</sup>[https://huggingface.co/ReneeYe/ConST\\_en2x\\_models](https://huggingface.co/ReneeYe/ConST_en2x_models)



TABLE XI  
EXAMPLES OF CORRECTING ASR AND ST ERRORS FROM THE MUST-C EN→DE TEST SET.

CASE 1	
Auto Transcription	My mother, <b>May</b> , was 18 when her father died, already in an <u>arranged</u> marriage already with two small girls.
Refined Transcription	My mother, <u>Mai</u> , was 18 when her father died, already in an <u>arranged</u> marriage, already with two small girls.
Gold Transcription	My mother, <u>Mai</u> , was 18 when her father died — already in an <u>arranged</u> marriage, already with two small girls.
Auto Translation	Meine Mutter, <b>Mai</b> , war 18, als ihr Vater starb, bereits in einer <b>angeordneten</b> Ehe, bereits mit zwei kleinen Mädchen.
Refined Translation	Meine Mutter, <u>Mai</u> , war 18, als ihr Vater starb, bereits in einer <u>arrangierten</u> Ehe, bereits mit zwei kleinen Mädchen.
Gold Translation	Meine Mutter <u>Mai</u> war 18, als ihr Vater starb – schon in einer <u>arrangierten</u> Ehe, schon mit zwei kleinen Mädchen.
CASE 2	
Auto Transcription	For years, because I’ve been interested in <b>intersects</b> , I’ve also been interested in <u>sex-difference research</u> .
Refined Transcription	For years, because I’ve been interested in <u>intersex</u> , I’ve also been interested in <u>sex-difference research</u> .
Gold Transcription	For years, because I’ve been interested in <u>intersex</u> , I’ve also been interested in <u>sex-difference research</u> .
Auto Translation	Jahrelang, weil ich mich für <b>Intersexuelle</b> interessiert habe, habe ich mich auch für <b>dieforschung von Geschlechtsunterschieden</b> interessiert.
Refined Translation	Jahrelang, weil ich mich für <u>Intersexuelle</u> interessiert habe, habe ich mich auch für <u>die Forschung über Geschlechtsunterschiede</u> interessiert.
Gold Translation	Seit Jahren schon, weil ich an <u>Intersexualität</u> interessiert war, habe ich mich auch für <u>Forschung im Bereich der Geschlechterdifferenz</u> interessiert.
CASE 3	
Auto Transcription	We want to encourage a world of creators, of inventors, of contributors, because this world that we live in, <u>this interactive world</u> , <b>as ours</b> .
Refined Transcription	We want to encourage a world of creators, of inventors, of contributors, because this world that we live in, <u>this interactive world</u> , <u>is ours</u> .
Gold Transcription	We want to encourage a world of creators, of inventors, of contributors, because this world that we live in, <u>this interactive world</u> , <u>is ours</u> .
Auto Translation	Wir wollen eine Welt der Schöpfer, der Erfinder, der Mitwirkenden fördern, weil diese Welt, in der wir leben, <b>in dieser interaktiven Welt</b> , <u>unsere ist</u> .
Refined Translation	Wir wollen eine Welt der Schöpfer, der Erfinder, der Mitwirkenden fördern, weil diese Welt, in der wir leben, <u>diese interaktive Welt</u> , <u>unsere ist</u> .
Gold Translation	Wir wollen die Welt der Erschaffer, der Erfinder, der Mitwirkenden ermutigen, denn diese Welt, in der wir leben, <u>diese interaktive Welt</u> , <u>gehört uns</u> .

Note: **Bold** text indicates incorrect words or phrases and underlined text indicates accurate words or phrases.

Additionally, the unnecessary word “in” in the phrase “this interactive world” from the automatic translation is removed during refinement, leading to a cleaner and more precise translation.

These cases highlight how the refinement process improves translation accuracy by addressing errors in both transcription and translation outputs. By leveraging information from both the automatic transcription and translation, our approach significantly enhances the overall quality of speech translation.

## VI. CONCLUSION

This paper explores how large language models (LLMs) can improve speech translation by simultaneously refining both transcription and translation using in-context learning and task-specific fine-tuning techniques. We begin by designing prompts tailored for translation refinement and evaluating their effectiveness within an in-context learning framework. Next, we fine-tune the LLaMA3-8B and Mistral-12B models, both with and without document-level context, to further enhance

the refinement process. Experimental results on both the MuST-C and CoVoST 2 datasets demonstrate that jointly refining transcription and translation results in significant improvements in speech translation quality. These findings highlight the advantages of combining both translation and transcription refinement to achieve superior overall performance. In future work, we will investigate the use of speech inputs for refining speech translation, which could lead to further improvements in translation quality.

## APPENDIX A DETAILED PERFORMANCE ON COVOST 2

Since using the GPT-3.5-turbo API can be expensive, we randomly select 500 samples from each translation task in the CoVoST 2 test set to create our in-house test set. Table XII shows the performance on this in-house test set. For  $Refine_{Both}$  and  $Refine_{ST}$ , in-context learning enhances the performance of ST refinement, and in few-shot settings, it also leads to noticeable improvements in transcription refinement. However,  $Paraphrase_{ST}$  lags behind both

TABLE XII  
PERFORMANCE OF GPT-3.5 WITH DIFFERENT IN-CONTEXT LEARNING STRATEGIES ON THE IN-HOUSE CoVoST 2 TEST SET.

Task	Model	BLEU $\uparrow$	En $\rightarrow$ De COMET $\uparrow$	WER $\downarrow$	BLEU $\uparrow$	En $\rightarrow$ Ca COMET $\uparrow$	WER $\downarrow$	BLEU $\uparrow$	En $\rightarrow$ Ar COMET $\uparrow$	WER $\downarrow$	BLEU $\uparrow$	En $\rightarrow$ Tr COMET $\uparrow$	WER $\downarrow$
-	SpeechLM-P / Whisper	28.73	.7502	11.25	34.73	.7618	10.36	21.61	.7924	10.36	19.06	.8013	10.36
In-Context Learning													
Refine <sub>Both</sub>	GPT-3.5 (0)	36.38	.8446	12.42	40.23	.8275	12.12	23.04	.8385	11.36	21.56	.8535	12.03
	GPT-3.5 (R1)	36.14	<b>.8467</b>	11.14	40.27	.8267	10.29	23.70	.8347	10.27	22.41	.8487	10.27
	GPT-3.5 (R3)	36.01	.8451	11.30	40.60	.8270	10.07	<b>24.95</b>	.8381	9.96	21.49	.8466	10.12
	GPT-3.5 (R5)	<b>36.56</b>	.8396	10.94	40.64	.8262	10.00	24.42	.8344	<b>9.94</b>	21.91	.8473	9.92
	GPT-3.5 (T1)	35.62	.8433	11.05	<b>41.40</b>	<b>.8293</b>	10.38	23.00	.8337	10.47	<b>22.58</b>	.8471	9.89
	GPT-3.5 (T3)	36.21	.8416	<b>10.65</b>	40.29	.8247	10.07	23.65	.8331	10.12	22.25	.8492	9.85
Refine <sub>ST</sub>	GPT-3.5 (T5)	35.26	.8403	10.74	40.90	.8228	<b>9.74</b>	24.13	.8305	9.96	22.04	.8463	<b>9.72</b>
	GPT-3.5 (0)	34.60	.8417	-	39.54	.8242	-	21.98	.8329	-	21.12	<b>.8461</b>	-
	GPT-3.5 (R1)	36.23	.8438	-	39.45	.8229	-	23.23	.8337	-	22.13	.8435	-
	GPT-3.5 (R3)	35.05	.8441	-	40.12	.8253	-	23.28	<b>.8352</b>	-	21.92	.8439	-
	GPT-3.5 (R5)	<b>36.87</b>	.8435	-	<b>40.65</b>	<b>.8261</b>	-	<b>24.06</b>	.8338	-	<b>22.47</b>	.8445	-
	GPT-3.5 (T1)	35.55	<b>.8451</b>	-	39.87	.8243	-	22.91	.8326	-	22.06	.8448	-
Paraphrase <sub>ST</sub>	GPT-3.5 (T3)	36.04	.8437	-	40.28	.8248	-	23.42	.8322	-	21.77	.8452	-
	GPT-3.5 (T5)	35.70	.8387	-	39.88	.8252	-	23.23	.8322	-	21.94	.8447	-
	GPT-3.5 (0)	16.68	.7728	-	18.04	.7042	-	12.27	.7755	-	9.86	.7902	-
	GPT-3.5 (T1)	26.14	<b>.7746</b>	-	29.72	.7631	-	17.69	.7876	-	15.14	.8016	-
	GPT-3.5 (T3)	28.81	.7677	-	33.69	.7684	-	19.31	.7898	-	17.02	.8061	-
	GPT-3.5 (T5)	<b>29.73</b>	.7649	-	<b>34.56</b>	<b>.7690</b>	-	<b>20.12</b>	<b>.7920</b>	-	<b>17.55</b>	<b>.8080</b>	-

TABLE XIII  
PERFORMANCE OF MISTRAL WITH DIFFERENT IN-CONTEXT LEARNING STRATEGIES FOR REFINE<sub>Both</sub> ON THE IN-HOUSE CoVoST 2 TEST SET.

Model	BLEU $\uparrow$	En $\rightarrow$ De COMET $\uparrow$	WER $\downarrow$	BLEU $\uparrow$	En $\rightarrow$ Ca COMET $\uparrow$	WER $\downarrow$	BLEU $\uparrow$	En $\rightarrow$ Ar COMET $\uparrow$	WER $\downarrow$	BLEU $\uparrow$	En $\rightarrow$ Tr COMET $\uparrow$	WER $\downarrow$
SpeechLM-P / Whisper	28.73	.7502	<b>11.25</b>	34.73	.7618	<b>10.36</b>	21.61	.7924	<b>10.36</b>	19.06	.8013	<b>10.36</b>
GPT-3.5 (0)	<b>36.38</b>	<b>.8446</b>	12.42	<b>40.23</b>	<b>.8275</b>	12.12	23.04	<b>.8385</b>	11.36	<b>21.56</b>	<b>.8535</b>	12.03
Mistral-12B (0)	33.24	.8349	16.03	38.11	.8082	14.87	23.32	.8202	15.32	19.51	.8244	15.36
Mistral-12B (R1)	34.19	.8406	15.62	38.12	.8096	13.47	23.56	.8192	15.23	19.26	.8288	13.78
Mistral-12B (R3)	34.06	.8387	14.99	38.72	.8130	13.58	23.54	.8190	13.87	19.21	.8297	13.83
Mistral-12B (R5)	34.11	.8355	13.59	38.55	.8156	13.14	23.36	.8212	13.05	19.98	.8357	13.32
Mistral-12B (T1)	34.11	.8378	14.52	38.71	.8116	13.61	23.06	.8196	14.34	20.31	.8325	14.50
Mistral-12B (T3)	34.41	.8394	13.12	38.86	.8078	12.41	23.45	.8239	12.16	20.96	.8330	12.23
Mistral-12B (T5)	35.05	.8370	12.90	39.02	.8114	11.89	<b>24.57</b>	.8254	12.07	20.99	.8313	12.21

Refine<sub>Both</sub> and Refine<sub>ST</sub> in overall performance, even falling below the baseline.

In addition to the closed-source GPT-3.5-turbo, we use the Refine<sub>Both</sub> task as a representative task to conduct experiments with the open-source Mistral-12B model on the in-house CoVoST 2 test set. The results, presented in Table XIII, show that, compared to the baseline system, different prompt selection strategies lead to improvements in both BLEU and COMET scores across all four language pairs. This demonstrates that Mistral can effectively refine translations without explicit fine-tuning, relying solely on its in-context learning capabilities.

#### APPENDIX B PROMPT EXAMPLES

Table XIV to Table XVI illustrate prompts used in tasks of Refine<sub>Both</sub>, Refine<sub>ST</sub>, and Paraphrase<sub>ST</sub>, respectively.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] P. Zhang, N. Ge, B. Chen, and K. Fan, "Lattice transformer for speech translation," in *Proceedings of ACL*, 2019, pp. 6475–6484.
- [2] M. Sperber and M. Paulik, "Speech translation and the end-to-end promise: Taking stock of where we are," in *Proceedings of ACL*, 2020, pp. 7409–7421.
- [3] T. K. Lam, S. Schamoni, and S. Riezler, "Cascaded models with cyclic feedback for direct speech translation," in *Proceedings of ICASSP*, 2021, pp. 7508–7512.
- [4] R. Ye, M. Wang, and L. Li, "End-to-end speech translation via cross-modal progressive training," in *Proceedings of INTERSPEECH*, 2021, pp. 2267–2271.
- [5] Q. Fang, R. Ye, L. Li, Y. Feng, and M. Wang, "STEMM: Self-learning with speech-text manifold mixup for speech translation," in *Proceedings of ACL*, 2022, pp. 7050–7062.
- [6] Y. Lei, Z. Xue, X. Zhao, H. Sun, S. Zhu, X. Lin, and D. Xiong, "CKDST: Comprehensively and effectively distill knowledge from machine translation to end-to-end speech translation," in *Findings of ACL*, 2023, pp. 3123–3137.
- [7] P. Chen, Z. Guo, B. Haddow, and K. Heafield, "Iterative translation refinement with large language models," in *Proceedings of EACL*, 2024, pp. 181–190. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2024.eamt-1.17>
- [8] V. Raunak, A. Sharaf, Y. Wang, H. H. Awadallah, and A. Menezes, "Leveraging gpt-4 for automatic translation post-editing," in *Findings of EMNLP*, 2023, pp. 12 009–12 024.
- [9] E. J. Hu, yelong shen, P. Wallis, Z. Allen-Zhu, Y. Li, S. Wang, L. Wang, and W. Chen, "LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models," in *Proceedings of ICLR*, 2022.

TABLE XIV  
A PROMPT EXAMPLE OF `REFINEBoth`, WITH GRAY AREAS INDICATING THE IN-CONTEXT LEARNING EXAMPLES.

Given the *English* transcription and *German* translation, both derived from speech and potentially containing errors, please provide the refined transcription and translation without any explanation. Present the results in two lines, starting with “Refined Transcription:” and “Refined Translation:”, respectively.

Let me give you 2 examples.

## 1

Transcription: *Now, there's a lot going on in this movie, so let me break this down and show you what's going on.*

Translation: *Es gibt viel in diesem Film, also lassen Sie mich das zerlegen und Ihnen zeigen, was los ist.*

Refined Transcription: *Now, there's a lot going on in this movie, so let me break this down and show you what's going on.*

Refined Translation: *Also, in diesem Film passiert sehr viel, also lassen Sie mich das analysieren und Ihnen zeigen was passiert.*

## 2

Transcription: *So I'm going to show you a movie where you're going to see that kind of dynamic.*

Translation: *Ich werde Ihnen einen Film zeigen, in dem Sie diese Art von Dynamik sehen werden.*

Refined Transcription: *So I'm going to show you a movie where you're going to see that kind of dynamic.*

Refined Translation: *Ich werde nun einen Film zeigen, in dem Sie diesen Vorgang sehen.*

Now consider the following transcription and translation, please provide the refined transcription and translation following above output format.

Transcription: *You're going to see the whole thing take place in this movie.*

Translation: *Sie werden sehen, wie das Ganze in diesem Film passiert.*

TABLE XV  
A PROMPT EXAMPLE OF `REFINEST`, WITH GRAY AREAS INDICATING THE IN-CONTEXT LEARNING EXAMPLES.

Given the *English* transcription and *German* translation, both derived from speech and potentially containing errors, please provide the refined translation without any explanation. Present the result in one line, starting with “Refined Translation:”.

Let me give you 2 examples.

## 1

Transcription: *Now, there's a lot going on in this movie, so let me break this down and show you what's going on.*

Translation: *Es gibt viel in diesem Film, also lassen Sie mich das zerlegen und Ihnen zeigen, was los ist.*

Refined Translation: *Also, in diesem Film passiert sehr viel, also lassen Sie mich das analysieren und Ihnen zeigen was passiert.*

## 2

Transcription: *So I'm going to show you a movie where you're going to see that kind of dynamic.*

Translation: *Ich werde Ihnen einen Film zeigen, in dem Sie diese Art von Dynamik sehen werden.*

Refined Translation: *Ich werde nun einen Film zeigen, in dem Sie diesen Vorgang sehen.*

Now consider the following transcription and translation, please provide the refined translation following above output format.

Transcription: *You're going to see the whole thing take place in this movie.*

Translation: *Sie werden sehen, wie das Ganze in diesem Film passiert.*

TABLE XVI  
A PROMPT EXAMPLE OF `PARAPHRASEST`, WITH GRAY AREAS INDICATING THE IN-CONTEXT LEARNING EXAMPLES.

Please give me a paraphrase in *German* without any explanation. Present the result in one line, starting with “Paraphrase:”.

Let me give you 2 examples.

## 1

Sentence: *Es gibt viel in diesem Film, also lassen Sie mich das zerlegen und Ihnen zeigen, was los ist.*

Paraphrase: *Also, in diesem Film passiert sehr viel, also lassen Sie mich das analysieren und Ihnen zeigen was passiert.*

## 2

Sentence: *Ich werde Ihnen einen Film zeigen, in dem Sie diese Art von Dynamik sehen werden.*

Paraphrase: *Ich werde nun einen Film zeigen, in dem Sie diesen Vorgang sehen.*

Now consider the following sentence, please provide the *German* paraphrase following above output format.

Sentence: *You're going to see the whole thing take place in this movie.*

- [10] T. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, M. Subbiah, J. D. Kaplan, P. Dhariwal, A. Neelakantan, P. Shyam, G. Sastry, A. Askell, S. Agarwal, A. Herbert-Voss, G. Krueger, T. Henighan, R. Child, A. Ramesh, D. Ziegler, J. Wu, C. Winter, C. Hesse, M. Chen, E. Sigler, M. Litwin, S. Gray, B. Chess, J. Clark, C. Berner, S. McCandlish, A. Radford, I. Sutskever, and D. Amodei, “Language models are few-shot learners,” in *Proceedings of NIPS*, 2020, pp. 1877–1901.
- [11] A. Dubey, A. Jauhri, A. Pandey, A. Kadian, A. Al-Dahle, A. Letman, A. Mathur, A. Schelten, A. Yang, A. Fan, and et al, “The llama 3 herd of models,” 2024.
- [12] M. A. Team, “Mistral nemo,” 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://mistral.ai/news/mistral-nemo/>

- [13] S. Koneru, T. Binh Nguyen, N.-Q. Pham, D. Liu, Z. Li, A. Waibel, and J. Niehues, “Blending LLMs into cascaded speech translation: KIT’s offline speech translation system for IWSLT 2024,” in *Proceedings of IWSLT*, Aug. 2024, pp. 183–191.
- [14] C. Wang, Y. Wu, S. Liu, M. Zhou, and Z. Yang, “Curriculum pre-training for end-to-end speech translation,” in *Proceedings of ACL*, 2020, pp. 3728–3738.
- [15] A. Alinejad and A. Sarkar, “Effectively pretraining a speech translation decoder with machine translation data,” in *Proceedings of EMNLP*, 2020, pp. 8014–8020.
- [16] Y. Tang, H. Gong, N. Dong, C. Wang, W.-N. Hsu, J. Gu, A. Baevski, X. Li, A. Mohamed, M. Auli, and J. Pino, “Unified speech-text pre-training for speech translation and recognition,” in *Proceedings of ACL*, 2022, pp. 1488–1499.
- [17] Z. Zhang, L. Zhou, J. Ao, S. Liu, L. Dai, J. Li, and F. Wei, “SpeechUT: Bridging speech and text with hidden-unit for encoder-decoder based speech-text pre-training,” in *Proceedings of EMNLP*, 2022, pp. 1663–1676.
- [18] J. Pino, L. Puzon, J. Gu, X. Ma, A. D. McCarthy, and D. Gopinath, “Harnessing indirect training data for end-to-end automatic speech translation: Tricks of the trade,” in *Proceedings of IWSLT*, 2019.
- [19] J. Pino, Q. Xu, X. Ma, M. J. Dousti, and Y. Tang, “Self-Training for End-to-End Speech Translation,” in *Proceedings of Interspeech*, 2020, pp. 1476–1480.
- [20] T. K. Lam, S. Schamoni, and S. Riezler, “Sample, translate, recombine: Leveraging audio alignments for data augmentation in end-to-end speech translation,” in *Proceedings of ACL*, 2022, pp. 245–254.
- [21] R. Ye, M. Wang, and L. Li, “Cross-modal contrastive learning for speech translation,” in *Proceedings of NAACL*, 2022, pp. 5099–5113.
- [22] H. Zhang, N. Si, Y. Chen, Z. Li, T. Niu, X. Yang, and D. Qu, “FCGCL: Fine- and coarse-granularity contrastive learning for speech translation,” in *Findings of EMNLP*, 2022, pp. 3048–3059.
- [23] S. Ouyang, R. Ye, and L. Li, “WACO: Word-aligned contrastive learning for speech translation,” in *Proceedings of ACL*, 2023, pp. 3891–3907.
- [24] W. Yin, Z. Liu, C. Zhao, T. Wang, J. Tong, and R. Ye, “Improving speech translation by fusing speech and text,” in *Findings of EMNLP*, 2023, pp. 6262–6273.
- [25] L. Zhang, K. Fan, B. Chen, and L. Si, “A simple concatenation can effectively improve speech translation,” in *Proceedings of ACL*, 2023, pp. 1793–1802.
- [26] Y. Zhou, Q. Fang, and Y. Feng, “CMOT: Cross-modal mixup via optimal transport for speech translation,” in *Proceedings of ACL*, 2023, pp. 7873–7887.
- [27] Y. Tang, J. Pino, X. Li, C. Wang, and D. Genzel, “Improving speech translation by understanding and learning from the auxiliary text translation task,” in *Proceedings of ACL*, 2021, pp. 4252–4261.
- [28] Y. Han, C. Xu, T. Xiao, and J. Zhu, “Modality adaption or regularization? a case study on end-to-end speech translation,” in *Proceedings of ACL*, 2023, pp. 1340–1348.
- [29] P. Gao, R. Zhang, Z. He, H. Wu, and H. Wang, “An empirical study of consistency regularization for end-to-end speech-to-text translation,” in *Proceedings of ACL*, 2024, pp. 242–256.
- [30] J. Wu, Y. Gaur, Z. Chen, L. Zhou, Y. Zhu, T. Wang, J. Li, S. Liu, B. Ren, L. Liu, and Y. Wu, “On decoder-only architecture for speech-to-text and large language model integration,” in *2023 IEEE Automatic Speech Recognition and Understanding Workshop (ASRU)*, 2023, pp. 1–8.
- [31] Z. Chen, H. Huang, A. Andrusenko, O. Hrinchuk, K. C. Puvvada, J. Li, S. Ghosh, J. Balam, and B. Ginsburg, “Salm: Speech-augmented language model with in-context learning for speech recognition and translation,” in *Proceedings of ICASSP*, 2024, pp. 13 521–13 525.
- [32] C. Tang, W. Yu, G. Sun, X. Chen, T. Tan, W. Li, L. Lu, Z. Ma, and C. Zhang, “SALMONN: towards generic hearing abilities for large language models,” in *Proceedings of ICLR*, 2024.
- [33] Y. Chu, J. Xu, X. Zhou, Q. Yang, S. Zhang, Z. Yan, C. Zhou, and J. Zhou, “Qwen-audio: Advancing universal audio understanding via unified large-scale audio-language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.07919*, 2023.
- [34] Y. Chu, J. Xu, Q. Yang, H. Wei, X. Wei, Z. Guo, Y. Leng, Y. Lv, J. He, J. Lin, C. Zhou, and J. Zhou, “Qwen2-audio technical report,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.10759*, 2024.
- [35] Y. Fathullah, C. Wu, E. Lakomkin, K. Li, J. Jia, Y. Shangguan, J. Mahadeokar, O. Kalinli, C. Fuegen, and M. Seltzer, “AudioChatLlama: Towards general-purpose speech abilities for LLMs,” in *Proceedings of NAACL*, Jun. 2024, pp. 5522–5532.
- [36] M. Gaido, S. Papi, M. Negri, and L. Bentivogli, “Speech translation with speech foundation models and large language models: What is there and what is missing?” in *Proceedings of ACL*, Aug. 2024, pp. 14 760–14 778.
- [37] Y. Hu, C. Chen, C.-H. Yang, R. Li, D. Zhang, Z. Chen, and E. Chng, “GenTranslate: Large language models are generative multilingual speech and machine translators,” in *Proceedings of ACL*, Aug. 2024, pp. 74–90.
- [38] R. Chatterjee, M. Negri, R. Rubino, and M. Turchi, “Findings of the WMT 2018 shared task on automatic post-editing,” in *Proceedings of WMT*, 2018, pp. 710–725.
- [39] Z. Zhang, J. Li, S. Tao, and H. Yang, “Lexical translation inconsistency-aware document-level translation repair,” in *Findings of ACL*, 2023, pp. 12 492–12 505.
- [40] Z. Feng, Y. Zhang, H. Li, W. Liu, J. Lang, Y. Feng, J. Wu, and Z. Liu, “Improving llm-based machine translation with systematic self-correction,” *Computing Research Repository*, vol. arXiv:2402.16379, 2024.
- [41] D. Ki and M. Carpuat, “Guiding large language models to post-edit machine translation with error annotations,” in *Findings of NAACL*, 2024.
- [42] S. Koneru, M. Exel, M. Huck, and J. Niehues, “Contextual refinement of translations: Large language models for sentence and document-level post-editing,” in *Proceedings of NAACL*, 2024, pp. 2711–2725.

- [43] W.-N. Hsu, B. Bolte, Y.-H. H. Tsai, K. Lakhotia, R. Salakhutdinov, and A. Mohamed, “Hubert: Self-supervised speech representation learning by masked prediction of hidden units,” *IEEE/ACM Trans. Audio, Speech and Lang. Proc.*, vol. 29, p. 3451–3460, 2021.
- [44] A. Radford, J. W. Kim, T. Xu, G. Brockman, C. Mcleavey, and I. Sutskever, “Robust speech recognition via large-scale weak supervision,” in *Proceedings of ICML*, 2023, pp. 28 492–28 518.
- [45] S. Gururangan, A. Marasović, S. Swayamdipta, K. Lo, I. Beltagy, D. Downey, and N. A. Smith, “Don’t stop pretraining: Adapt language models to domains and tasks,” in *Proceedings of ACL*, 2020, pp. 8342–8360.
- [46] J. Tiedemann and Y. Scherrer, “Neural machine translation with extended context,” in *Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Discourse in Machine Translation*, Sep. 2017, pp. 82–92.
- [47] Y. Li, J. Li, J. Jiang, S. Tao, H. Yang, and M. Zhang, “P-Transformer: Towards Better Document-to-Document Neural Machine Translation,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 31, pp. 3859–3870, 2023.
- [48] B. Zhang, I. Titov, B. Haddow, and R. Sennrich, “Beyond sentence-level end-to-end speech translation: Context helps,” in *Proceedings of ACL*, 2021, pp. 2566–2578.
- [49] M. A. Di Gangi, R. Cattoni, L. Bentivogli, M. Negri, and M. Turchi, “MuST-C: a Multilingual Speech Translation Corpus,” in *Proceedings of NAACL*, 2019, pp. 2012–2017.
- [50] C. Wang, A. Wu, and J. Pino, “Covost 2: A massively multilingual speech-to-text translation corpus,” *Computing Research Repository*, vol. arXiv:2007.10310, 2020.
- [51] Q. Fang and Y. Feng, “Understanding and bridging the modality gap for speech translation,” in *Proceedings of ACL*, 2023, pp. 15 864–15 881.
- [52] Z. Zhang, S. Chen, L. Zhou, Y. Wu, S. Ren, S. Liu, Z. Yao, X. Gong, L. Dai, J. Li, and F. Wei, “Speechlm: Enhanced speech pre-training with unpaired textual data,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 32, pp. 2177–2187, 2024.
- [53] Y. Zheng, R. Zhang, J. Zhang, Y. Ye, and Z. Luo, “LlamaFactory: Unified efficient fine-tuning of 100+ language models,” in *Proceedings of ACL: System Demonstrations*, 2024, pp. 400–410.
- [54] M. Post, “A call for clarity in reporting BLEU scores,” in *Proceedings of WMT*, 2018, pp. 186–191.
- [55] A. Bosselut, H. Rashkin, M. Sap, C. Malaviya, A. Celikyilmaz, and Y. Choi, “COMET: Commonsense transformers for automatic knowledge graph construction,” in *Proceedings of ACL*, 2019, pp. 4762–4779.
- [56] P. Koehn, “Statistical significance tests for machine translation evaluation,” in *Proceedings of EMNLP*, 2004, pp. 388–395.
- [57] T. Zhang, V. Kishore, F. Wu, K. Q. Weinberger, and Y. Artzi, “Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert,” in *proceedings of ICLR*, 2020.
- [58] X. L. Li, A. Holtzman, D. Fried, P. Liang, J. Eisner, T. Hashimoto, L. Zettlemoyer, and M. Lewis, “Contrastive decoding: Open-ended text generation as optimization,” in *Proceedings of ACL*, 2023, pp. 12 286–12 312.
- [59] A. Radford, J. Wu, R. Child, D. Luan, D. Amodei, and I. Sutskever, “Language models are unsupervised multitask learners,” *OpenAI blog*, 2019.
- [60] T. Gao, X. Yao, and D. Chen, “SimCSE: Simple contrastive learning of sentence embeddings,” in *Proceedings of EMNLP*, Nov. 2021, pp. 6894–6910.
- [61] Z. Sun, M. Wang, H. Zhou, C. Zhao, S. Huang, J. Chen, and L. Li, “Rethinking document-level neural machine translation,” in *Findings of ACL*, 2022, pp. 3537–3548.
- [62] L. Miculicich Werlen and A. Popescu-Belis, “Validation of an automatic metric for the accuracy of pronoun translation (APT),” in *Proceedings of DiscoMT*, 2017, pp. 17–25.
- [63] T. Kocmi and C. Federmann, “Large language models are state-of-the-art evaluators of translation quality,” in *Proceedings of EAMT*, 2023, pp. 193–203.