

# Streaming Multi-Talker ASR with Token-Level Serialized Output Training

Naoyuki Kanda<sup>1</sup>, Jian Wu<sup>1</sup>, Yu Wu<sup>2</sup>, Xiong Xiao<sup>1</sup>, Zhong Meng<sup>1</sup>, Xiaofei Wang<sup>1</sup>, Yashesh Gaur<sup>1</sup>, Zhuo Chen<sup>1</sup>, Jinyu Li<sup>1</sup>, Takuya Yoshioka<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Microsoft Cloud+AI, USA <sup>2</sup>Microsoft Research Asia, China

{nakanda, wujian, yuwu1, xioxiao, zhme, xiaofewa, yagaur, zhuc, jinyuli, tayoshio}@microsoft.com

## Abstract

This paper proposes a token-level serialized output training (t-SOT), a novel framework for streaming multi-talker automatic speech recognition (ASR). Unlike existing streaming multi-talker ASR models using multiple output branches, the t-SOT model has only a single output branch that generates recognition tokens (e.g., words, subwords) of multiple speakers in chronological order based on their emission times. A special token that indicates the change of “virtual” output channels is introduced to keep track of the overlapping utterances. Compared to the prior streaming multi-talker ASR models, the t-SOT model has the advantages of less inference cost and a simpler model architecture. Moreover, in our experiments with LibriSpeechMix and LibriCSS datasets, the t-SOT-based transformer transducer model achieves the state-of-the-art word error rates by a significant margin to the prior results. For non-overlapping speech, the t-SOT model is on par with a single-talker ASR model in terms of both accuracy and computational cost, opening the door for deploying one model for both single- and multi-talker scenarios.

**Index Terms:** multi-talker speech recognition, serialized output training, streaming inference

## 1. Introduction

Speech overlaps are ubiquitous in human-to-human conversations. For example, it was reported that 6–15% of speaking time was overlapped in meetings [1, 2]. The overlap rate can be even higher for daily conversations [3, 4, 5]. Nevertheless, most of the current automatic speech recognition (ASR) systems are designed to transcribe non-overlapping audio, and even a short overlap period significantly hurts the ASR accuracy [6, 7]. A traditional approach for recognizing the overlapping speech is to apply speech separation, followed by applying ASR for each separated signal. While shown to be effective (e.g., [3, 8, 9]), such an approach makes the entire system complicated and hard to optimize for the best ASR accuracy.

To further improve the accuracy for the multi-talker scenario, various approaches were proposed to train an ASR model that can directly recognize multiple utterances from the multi-talker audio. A popular approach is to use a neural network that has multiple output branches to generate transcriptions for overlapping speakers (e.g., [10, 11, 12, 13, 14]), where the model is often trained with permutation invariant training [15, 16, 17]. Another recently proposed approach is serialized output training (SOT) [18], which uses a model that has only a single output branch. In SOT, the single output branch generates transcriptions for multiple speakers one after another, where the speaker-wise transcriptions are interleaved by a special separator token that indicates the speaker change. The SOT-based ASR model achieved the state-of-the-art (SOTA) word error rate (WER) [19, 20, 21] for various multi-talker test sets including LibriSpeechMix [18], LibriCSS [6] and AMI [22]. However,




Figure 1: An overview of the token-level serialized output training for a case with up to two concurrent utterances.

the SOT model assumes the attention-based encoder-decoder (AED) [23, 24] as a backbone ASR system, which renders the model usable only for the offline (i.e. non-streaming) inference.

A few recent studies explored the streaming multi-talker ASR problem to transcribe each spoken word with a low latency even for overlapping speech. Streaming unmixing and recognition transducer (SURT) [25] and multi-speaker recurrent neural network transducer (MS-RNN-T) [26] were concurrently proposed based on a similar idea, where the model has two output branches to generate two simultaneous transcriptions for overlapping speech. However, their reported WERs still lagged far behind the SOTA result of the offline SOT-model.

In this paper, we present token-level serialized output training (t-SOT), a novel streaming multi-talker ASR framework. With t-SOT, words spoken by overlapping speakers are generated by a single output branch in a chronological order based on their emission times.<sup>1</sup> A special token indicating “virtual” output channels is used to keep track of transcriptions for overlapping speakers.<sup>2</sup> Compared to the prior streaming multi-talker ASR models [25, 26], the t-SOT model has advantages of less inference cost and a simpler model architecture. Moreover, our experimental results with LibriSpeechMix and LibriCSS datasets show that the transformer transducer (TT) [31] trained with t-SOT framework achieves new SOTA results by a significant margin to the prior results including the offline models.

## 2. Streaming multi-talker ASR with t-SOT

### 2.1. Basic t-SOT for up to two concurrent utterances

We first explain the basic idea of t-SOT by assuming that the input audio contains overlapping speech of up to two concurrent

<sup>1</sup>The idea of emission-time-based serialization was concurrently proposed in [27]. However, their speaker tracking method is different from ours, and their experiments were limited to non-streaming models.

<sup>2</sup>While several prior works proposed to insert special tokens in a transcription [28, 29, 30, 18], our work is the first to propose a special token for transcribing *overlapping* utterances in a *streaming* fashion.

Table 1: Comparison of representative multi-talker ASR frameworks. A preferable property in each row is presented in **bold font**.

	SOT [18]	SURT [25], MS-RNN-T [26]	t-SOT (proposed method)
Streaming inference	Not-available	<b>Available</b>	<b>Available</b>
Inference cost on decoder	<b>Same with single-talker model</b>	$K$ -times* of single-talker model	<b>Same with single-talker model</b>
Max concurrent utterances	<b>Unlimited</b>	Pre-defined	Pre-defined
Speaker counting	<b>Available</b>	Not-available	Not-available
Model architecture	<b>Same with single-talker model</b>	Multiple output branches	<b>Same with single-talker model</b>
Restriction on ASR-type	Restricted to AED-based ASR	<b>No restriction</b>	<b>No restriction</b>
Accuracy on non-overlapping audio <sup>◊</sup>	<b>Good</b>	Bad	<b>Good</b>
Accuracy on overlapping audio <sup>◊</sup>	<b>Good</b>	Fair	<b>Good</b>

\*  $K$  is the number of output branches of the model. ◊ Good/Fair/Bad are judged based on the results in Tables 2–4.

**Algorithm 1** Generating a serialized transcription for a training sample with up to two concurrent utterances

- 1: **Given** a speech sample with a time- and speaker-annotated transcription  $\mathcal{T} = (w_i, e_i, s_i)_{i=1}^N$  where  $w_i$  is  $i$ -th token, and  $e_i$  and  $s_i$  are the emission time and the speaker of  $w_i$ , respectively.
- 2: Sort  $\mathcal{T}$  in ascending order of  $e_i$ .
- 3: Initialize a list of tokens  $\mathcal{W} \leftarrow [w_1]$ .
- 4: **for**  $i$  in  $2, \dots, N$  **do**
- 5:   **if**  $s_i \neq s_{i-1}$  **then**
- 6:     Append  $\langle cc \rangle$  to  $\mathcal{W}$ .
- 7:   Append  $w_i$  to  $\mathcal{W}$ .
- 8: **return**  $\mathcal{W}$

utterances as shown in Fig. 1. Note that the audio may contain utterances of any number of speakers as long as the number of *concurrent* utterances is less than or equal to two.

Our idea is to serialize transcriptions for multiple speakers by sorting the recognition tokens of all speakers in a chronological order. The algorithm to generate the serialized transcription for a training sample is described in Algorithm 1. Suppose we have a training audio sample with a time- and speaker-annotated transcription. By joining all words in all speakers’ transcriptions, we can represent such transcription as a sequence  $\mathcal{T} = (w_i, e_i, s_i)_{i=1}^N$ , where  $w_i$  is the  $i$ -th token (e.g., word, subword) in the joined sequence,  $e_i$  is the emission time (i.e. end time) of  $w_i$ , and  $s_i$  is the speaker of  $w_i$  (line 1). We first sort  $\mathcal{T}$  based on  $e_i$  in an ascending order (line 2). The serialized transcription  $\mathcal{W}$  is initialized as a list that contains the first token  $w_1$  in  $\mathcal{T}$  (line 3). We then iteratively append  $w_i$  for  $i = 2, \dots, N$  while inserting a special “channel change” token  $\langle cc \rangle$  if the speaker of the consecutive two tokens in  $\mathcal{T}$  are different (lines 4–7). The resultant  $\mathcal{W}$  is the serialized transcription of up to two concurrent utterances (line 8), which is exemplified in the “serialized transcription” in Fig. 1.

We train a streaming end-to-end (E2E) ASR model based on the audio samples and the corresponding serialized transcriptions. Any streaming ASR models can be used, including connectionist temporal classification [32], RNN-T [33], and TT [31], without changing the structure from the conventional single-talker model. During inference, a sequence of tokens including  $\langle cc \rangle$  is generated in a streaming fashion, which can then be reformatted to two virtual output channels by switching the channel index at the recognized  $\langle cc \rangle$  position as shown in the “Deserialization” process in Fig. 1. Note that the first recognized token is always assigned to the first virtual channel.

## 2.2. Generalized t-SOT for up to $M$ concurrent utterances

The idea of t-SOT can be easily extended to deal with up to  $M$  concurrent utterances by introducing  $M$  special tokens  $\{\langle cc_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle cc_M \rangle\}$ , where  $\langle cc_m \rangle$  indicates that the subsequent tokens will be placed to the  $m$ th virtual channel. A complete algorithm to generate the serialized transcription is shown in

Appendix A. Note that we conducted experiments with only up to two concurrent utterances because overlaps of more than two speakers are rare in many practical scenarios [1], and it seems difficult for humans to read more than two simultaneous transcriptions in real time.

## 2.3. Comparison to prior works

Table 1 summarizes the differences between t-SOT and representative multi-talker ASR methods. Compared with SOT [18] which can be used only for non-streaming inference, a t-SOT model can recognize each spoken word in a streaming fashion. The t-SOT model is also advantageous because the model architecture is not restricted to the AED. On the other hand, t-SOT has the limitation on the maximum number of concurrent utterances that the model can recognize. The t-SOT model also cannot count the number of speakers in the audio segment.

For streaming multi-talker ASR, the t-SOT framework has various advantages over SURT [25] and MS-RNN-T [26]. Firstly, t-SOT requires only a single decoding process as with the conventional single-talker ASR while SURT and MS-RNN-T require to execute the decoder multiple times (i.e., one decoder run for each output branches). Therefore, the t-SOT model fundamentally requires less computation than the prior models. Secondly, the t-SOT model architecture is much simpler than SURT and MS-RNN-T because the same architecture as the single-talker ASR model can be used without any modification. Thirdly, our experimental results showed that the t-SOT-based ASR model achieved significantly better WER than the prior SOTA results for both non-overlapping and overlapping speech as detailed in the next section.

## 3. Experiments

We first conducted an experiment by using the LibriSpeechMix evaluation set [18], where we limited the number of speakers in each audio segment to up to two. We then conducted an evaluation with LibriCSS [6] where each long-form audio contains many utterances from 8 speakers.

### 3.1. Experiment with LibriSpeechMix

#### 3.1.1. Experimental settings

As the first evaluation dataset, we used LibriSpeechMix [18], which is made by mixing up to three utterances randomly sampled from LibriSpeech [38]. In this work, we used the single-speaker (i.e. non-overlapping) evaluation set and the two-speaker-mixed evaluation set. For the two-speaker-mixed evaluation set, two utterances are mixed with a randomly-determined delay such that each evaluation sample contains a partial speaker overlap. We evaluated the WER in the same way as the prior work [18] did. That is, the recognition hy-

Table 2: WER (%) for LibriSpeechMix test set with various non-streaming and streaming multi-talker ASR models. The algorithmic latency is shown in the “Latency” column, where 160 msec is our target configuration. No language model was used for all results including the ones in prior works.

Model	# of param.	Latency (msec)	Test WER	
			1spk	2spk
<i>(Non-streaming Models)</i>				
PIT LSTM-AED [18]	161M <sup>†</sup>	∞	6.7	11.9
SOT LSTM-AED [34]	136M	∞	4.5	10.3
SOT Conformer-AED [19]	129M	∞	3.6	4.9
<i>(Streaming Models)</i>				
LSTM-SURT [35]	81M <sup>†</sup>	150	-	10.3
PIT-MS-RNN-T [26]	81M <sup>†</sup>	30	7.6	10.2
Transformer-SURT [36]	85M <sup>†</sup>	1000	-	9.1
PIT-MS-RNN-T [37]	81M <sup>†</sup>	30	-	8.8
t-SOT TT-18	82M	40	5.1	8.4
t-SOT TT-18	82M	160	4.9	6.9
t-SOT TT-18	82M	640	4.2	6.2
t-SOT TT-18	82M	2560	3.9	5.2
t-SOT TT-36	139M	160	4.3	6.2
t-SOT TT-36	139M	2560	3.3	4.4

<sup>†</sup> Models with two output branches, for which most parameters are loaded and used twice in the inference.

potheses (= one or two hypotheses after deserialization) and the references are compared for all possible speaker permutations, and the speaker permutation that produces the minimum number of errors is selected to calculate the WER. A hypothesis (or reference) that does not have a corresponding reference (or hypothesis) is regarded as all insertion (or deletion) errors.

We simulated the training data by randomly mixing up to two utterances from “train\_960” of the LibriSpeech training data. In the training data generation, for each sample, we first selected the number of speakers  $S$  from  $\{1, 2\}$  with  $p\%$  and  $(100 - p)\%$  probabilities for  $S = 1$  and  $2$ , respectively, where  $p = 50$  unless otherwise stated. We then randomly selected  $S$  utterances from “train\_960”. If  $S$  was equal to two, we further randomly sampled the delay  $d$  for the second utterance  $u_2$  from  $\text{Uniform}(0, \text{len}(u_1))$ , where  $\text{len}(u_1)$  is the duration of the first utterance  $u_1$ . Utterance  $u_1$  and utterance  $u_2$ , delayed by  $d$ , were then mixed without changing the original volumes. We used the time-alignment generated by the Montreal Forced Aligner [39] to generate the serialized transcription for each training sample.<sup>3</sup> To increase the variability of the training data, we applied the speed perturbation [40] with the ratios of  $\{0.9, 1.0, 1.1\}$ , the volume perturbation with the ratio between 0.125 to 2.0, and the adaptive SpecAugment [41]. Following [20, 37], we simulated the training data on the fly to generate infinite variations of the training samples.

For the streaming ASR model, we used a TT with a chunk-wise look-ahead proposed in [42]. The encoder consists of 2 convolution layers, each of which halves the time resolution, followed by a 18-layer or 36-layer transformer with relative positional encoding. We refer to the model with the 18-layer transformer as “TT-18” and the model with the 36-layer transformer as “TT-36”. Each transformer block consists of a 512-dim multi-head attention with 8 heads and a 2048-dim point-wise feed forward layer with Gaussian error linear unit (GELU) activation function. Our TT’s prediction network consists of 2 layers of 1024-dim long short-term memory (LSTM). We used 4,000 word pieces plus blank and  $\langle \text{cc} \rangle$  tokens as the recognition

<sup>3</sup>If one word consisted of multiple subwords, the emission time was shared for all subwords while keeping the order of subwords.

Table 3: WER (%) on LibriSpeechMix for single- and multi-talker models with different training configurations. All models have 160 msec of algorithmic latency.

Model	Training data		Dev WER		Test WER	
	1spk	2spk	1spk	2spk	1spk	2spk
single-talker TT-18	100%	-	4.3	63.2	4.5	63.7
t-SOT TT-18	67%	33%	4.3	7.3	4.7	7.4
t-SOT TT-18	50%	50%	4.3	6.9	4.9	6.9
single-talker TT-36	100%	-	3.9	62.9	4.4	63.3
t-SOT TT-36	67%	33%	3.8	6.4	4.4	6.3
t-SOT TT-36	50%	50%	3.9	6.0	4.3	6.2

units. The audio input feature is an 80-dim log mel-filterbank extracted every 10 msec. As proposed in [42], we controlled the algorithmic latency of the model based on the chunk size of the attention mask. The minimum possible latency is 40 msec, which is determined by the time resolution of the input feature sequence and the 2 convolutional layers with 2-times subsampling in the encoder. For all models, we performed 225K training iterations with 16 GPUs, each of which consumed mini-batches of 12,000 frames. We used an AdamW optimizer with a linear decay learning rate schedule with a peak learning rate of  $1.5e-3$  after 25K warm up iterations.

### 3.1.2. Main results

Table 2 shows the comparison of our t-SOT model and prior multi-talker ASR models on the LibriSpeechMix test set. We evaluated t-SOT TT models with various algorithmic latency and model sizes. Firstly, we observed that the t-SOT TT-18 with only 40 msec algorithmic latency already outperformed the results of all prior streaming multi-talker ASR models. Note that even though t-SOT TT-18 has almost the same number of parameters with SURT [25, 35] or MS-RNN-T [26, 37], t-SOT is more time- and space-efficient in the inference because SURT and MS-RNN-T run decoding twice, once for each of the two output branches. Secondly, we observed a significant WER reduction by increasing algorithmic latency and the model size. In our experiment, enlarging the latency for 4 times (e.g., 160 msec to 640 msec) achieved a similar level of WER reduction to doubling the number of layers (i.e., TT-18 to TT-36). Notably, our t-SOT TT-36 with 2560 msec latency achieved 3.3% and 4.4% of WERs for single-speaker and two-speaker-mixed test sets, respectively, which are even better than the prior SOTA results by the offline SOT Conformer-AED [19].<sup>4</sup>

### 3.1.3. Comparison with single-talker ASR models

Table 3 shows a comparison of various single-talker and t-SOT models. For the t-SOT model, we tested different mixes of single- and two-speaker training samples by changing  $p$  in the on-the-fly data generation (Section 3.1.1). Firstly, as we expected, the single-talker TT model showed bad WERs for two speaker overlapping speech, which proves the necessity of multi-talker ASR modeling. Secondly, we observed marginal WER improvement for the single-speaker evaluation set when the model observed more single-speaker training samples, which however came with the cost of WER degradation for the two-speaker-mixed evaluation set. Thirdly, we observed a slight degradation in single-talker WER for the t-SOT TT-18 compared to the single-talker TT-18 most likely because TT-18

<sup>4</sup>Prior offline SOT Conformer-AED [19] was trained with a finite set of simulated data instead of on-the-fly data generation [20, 37], which is most likely the reason of better WER by our t-SOT TT.

Table 4: WER (%) on the monaural LibriCSS test set in the continuous input evaluation setting. A macro average of WERs is shown in the ‘‘Avg.’’ column. OL and OS are 0% overlap conditions with long and short inter-utterance silences. For each overlapping condition, the best WER with streaming ASR models is shown in **bold font**, and the best number among all ASR models are shown with underline.

System	Algorithmic latency	WER (%) for different overlap ratio						
		OL	OS	10	20	30	40	Avg.
<i>(Non-streaming ASR models with speech separation)</i>								
BLSTM-CSS + Hybrid ASR [6]	1.2 sec <sup>‡</sup> + (utterance length)*	16.3	17.6	20.9	26.1	32.6	36.1	24.9
Conformer-CSS + Transformer-AED-ASR w/ LM [9]	1.2 sec <sup>‡</sup> + (utterance length)*	<u>6.1</u>	6.9	9.1	12.5	16.7	19.3	11.8
Conformer-CSS + Transformer-AED-ASR w/ LM [43]	1.2 sec <sup>‡</sup> + (utterance length)*	6.4	7.5	8.4	9.4	12.4	13.2	9.6
<i>(Streaming ASR models)</i>								
SURT w/ DP-LSTM [44]	350 msec	9.8	19.1	20.6	20.4	23.9	26.8	20.1
SURT w/ DP-Transformer [44]	350 msec	9.3	21.1	21.2	25.9	28.2	31.7	22.9
Single-talker TT-18	160 msec	7.0	7.3	14.0	20.9	27.9	34.3	18.6
Single-talker TT-36	160 msec	<b>6.5</b>	6.7	13.1	20.4	27.0	34.0	18.0
t-SOT TT-18 (proposed)	160 msec	7.5	7.5	8.5	10.5	12.6	14.0	10.1
t-SOT TT-36 (proposed)	160 msec	6.7	<b>6.1</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>9.3</b>	<b>11.6</b>	<b>12.9</b>	<b>9.0</b>

<sup>‡</sup> Latency incurred by CSS. \* Latency incurred by VAD and ASR. The average of utterance lengths in the LibriCSS test set is 7.5 sec.

does not have sufficient capacity to fully learn the representation of normal tokens along with the additional  $\langle cc \rangle$  token. On the other hand, t-SOT TT-36 achieved even better results than single-talker TT-36 for the single-talker evaluation data. Our interpretation for this result is as follows: Because the overlapping speech in the training data works as a kind of data augmentation, even the accuracy for non-overlapping speech can be improved as long as the model has sufficient capacity to absorb the training data variations. Note that a similar improvement for single-talker test set was reported for SOT-based ASR [18].

It is noteworthy that the t-SOT model achieved almost the same, and sometimes even better, WER compared to the single-talker ASR models for the single-talker evaluation set. This property is desirable to deploy one model for both single-talker and multi-talker application scenarios. On the contrary, severe WER degradation for the non-overlapping speech was reported for the prior streaming multi-talker ASR models [26, 44], where the authors of [44] attributed the degradation to duplicated or no hypotheses being generated from multiple output branches. We believe the t-SOT-based model can largely eliminate this issue by using only a single output branch.

## 3.2. Experiment with LibriCSS

### 3.2.1. Experimental settings

To evaluate the t-SOT model in a more realistic setting where the input audio stream contains more than two speakers with up to two concurrent utterances at each time frame, we conducted an evaluation with LibriCSS [6]. LibriCSS is a set of 8-speaker recordings made by playing back ‘‘test\_clean’’ of LibriSpeech in a real meeting room. The original recording was made with a 7-ch microphone array, and we used the first channel of the recording in our experiment. The recordings are 10 hours long in total, and they are categorized by the speaker overlap ratio from 0% to 40%. In each category, there are 10 mini-sessions, each of which is 10 min long. We used sessions 1 to 9 (i.e. excluding the session 0) for the evaluation by following the official data split [6].

We trained TT models by initializing the parameters based on the model trained in the LibriSpeechMix experiment. We simulated additional training samples consisting of  $S \sim \text{Uniform}(1, 5)$  utterances on the fly. Randomly generated room impulse responses and noise were further added to simulate the reverberant recordings. We performed 50K training iterations with 16 GPUs, each of which consumed a mini-batch of 12,000

frames. The AdamW optimizer was used with a linear decay learning rate schedule starting from the learning rate of  $1.5e-4$ .

We evaluated TT models by following ‘‘continuous input evaluation’’ setting [6], where the ASR system was applied to pre-segmented audio (roughly 1–2 min) without using utterance boundary information. We simply applied our TT models to the audio stream without any further segmentation like voice activity detection (VAD). By following [6], we evaluated speaker-agnostic WER (SagWER) [45].<sup>5</sup>

### 3.2.2. Evaluation results

The evaluation results are shown in Table 4. We observed the proposed t-SOT TT model achieved significantly better WER for all conditions compared to the prior streaming ASR models. Surprisingly, t-SOT TT-36 with 160 msec latency even outperformed the strong prior results based on the Conformer-based continuous speech separation (CSS) [9] and an offline Transformer-AED-based ASR [46] with language model (LM) fusion for 5 out of 6 conditions, resulted in the new SOTA average WER. This result strongly indicates the advantage of the end-to-end multi-talker modeling over the approach to combine independent modules. It is also noteworthy that the t-SOT models came close to the same-sized single-talker TT models’ performance for the non-overlapping test conditions (OL and OS). The t-SOT TT-36 even outperformed the single-talker TT-36 for non-overlapping conditions on average (6.4% vs. 6.6%), which is consistent with the result for LibriSpeechMix (Section 3.1.3).

## 4. Conclusions

In this paper, we presented t-SOT, a novel framework for streaming multi-talker ASR. Unlike prior streaming multi-talker ASR models, the t-SOT model has only a single output branch that generates recognition tokens from overlapping speakers in chronological order based on their emission times. A special token that indicates the change of the virtual output channels is introduced to keep track of the overlapping speakers. We evaluated t-SOT with LibriSpeechMix and LibriCSS and showed that t-SOT model achieved new SOTA results even with streaming inference using a simpler model architecture.

<sup>5</sup>It is highly computational demanding to calculate SagWER especially for many hypotheses without time alignment information [45]. Due to the difficulty, we don’t have a comparable result for SOT-based ASR models. For t-SOT models, we were still able to calculate SagWER since the number of concurrent hypotheses was limited to two.

## 5. References

- [1] Ö. Çetin and E. Striberg, “Analysis of overlaps in meetings by dialog factors, hot spots, speakers, and collection site: Insights for automatic speech recognition,” in *Interspeech*, 2006.
- [2] T. Yoshioka *et al.*, “Recognizing overlapped speech in meetings: A multichannel separation approach using neural networks,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, 2018, p. 3038–3042.
- [3] N. Kanda *et al.*, “Guided source separation meets a strong ASR backend: Hitachi/Paderborn University joint investigation for dinner party ASR,” in *Interspeech*, 2019, pp. 1248–1252.
- [4] J. Barker, S. Watanabe, E. Vincent, and J. Trmal, “The fifth ‘CHiME’ speech separation and recognition challenge: Dataset, task and baselines,” *Interspeech*, pp. 1561–1565, 2018.
- [5] S. Watanabe *et al.*, “CHiME-6 challenge: Tackling multispeaker speech recognition for unsegmented recordings,” in *CHiME 2020*, 2020.
- [6] Z. Chen, T. Yoshioka, L. Lu, T. Zhou, Z. Meng, Y. Luo, J. Wu, and J. Li, “Continuous speech separation: dataset and analysis,” in *ICASSP*, 2020, pp. 7284–7288.
- [7] D. Raj *et al.*, “Integration of speech separation, diarization, and recognition for multi-speaker meetings: System description, comparison, and analysis,” in *SLT*, 2021, pp. 897–904.
- [8] T. Yoshioka *et al.*, “Advances in online audio-visual meeting transcription,” in *ASRU*, 2019, pp. 276–283.
- [9] S. Chen, Y. Wu, Z. Chen, J. Wu, J. Li, T. Yoshioka, C. Wang, S. Liu, and M. Zhou, “Continuous speech separation with Conformer,” in *ICASSP*, 2021, pp. 5749–5753.
- [10] D. Yu, X. Chang, and Y. Qian, “Recognizing multi-talker speech with permutation invariant training,” *Interspeech*, pp. 2456–2460, 2017.
- [11] H. Seki, T. Hori, S. Watanabe, J. Le Roux, and J. R. Hershey, “A purely end-to-end system for multi-speaker speech recognition,” in *ACL*, 2018, pp. 2620–2630.
- [12] X. Chang, Y. Qian, K. Yu, and S. Watanabe, “End-to-end monaural multi-speaker ASR system without pretraining,” in *ICASSP*, 2019, pp. 6256–6260.
- [13] X. Chang *et al.*, “MIMO-SPEECH: End-to-end multi-channel multi-speaker speech recognition,” in *ASRU*, 2019, pp. 237–244.
- [14] A. Tripathi, H. Lu, and H. Sak, “End-to-end multi-talker overlapping speech recognition,” in *ICASSP*, 2020, pp. 6129–6133.
- [15] J. R. Hershey *et al.*, “Deep clustering: Discriminative embeddings for segmentation and separation,” in *ICASSP*, 2016, pp. 31–35.
- [16] Y. Isik, J. L. Roux, Z. Chen, S. Watanabe, and J. R. Hershey, “Single-channel multi-speaker separation using deep clustering,” in *Interspeech*, 2016, pp. 545–549.
- [17] D. Yu, M. Kolbæk, Z.-H. Tan, and J. Jensen, “Permutation invariant training of deep models for speaker-independent multi-talker speech separation,” in *ICASSP*, 2017, pp. 241–245.
- [18] N. Kanda, Y. Gaur, X. Wang, Z. Meng, and T. Yoshioka, “Serialized output training for end-to-end overlapped speech recognition,” in *Interspeech*, 2020, pp. 2797–2801.
- [19] N. Kanda *et al.*, “End-to-end speaker-attributed ASR with Transformer,” in *Interspeech*, 2021, pp. 4413–4417.
- [20] N. Kanda *et al.*, “Large-scale pre-training of end-to-end multi-talker ASR for meeting transcription with single distant microphone,” in *Interspeech*, 2021, pp. 3430–3434.
- [21] N. Kanda *et al.*, “A comparative study of modular and joint approaches for speaker-attributed asr on monaural long-form audio,” in *ASRU*, 2021.
- [22] J. Carletta *et al.*, “The AMI meeting corpus: A pre-announcement,” in *International workshop on machine learning for multimodal interaction*, 2006, pp. 28–39.
- [23] J. Chorowski, D. Bahdanau, K. Cho, and Y. Bengio, “End-to-end continuous speech recognition using attention-based recurrent NN: First results,” in *NIPS Workshop on Deep Learning*, 2014.
- [24] J. K. Chorowski *et al.*, “Attention-based models for speech recognition,” in *NIPS*, 2015, pp. 577–585.
- [25] L. Lu, N. Kanda, J. Li, and Y. Gong, “Streaming end-to-end multi-talker speech recognition,” *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 28, pp. 803–807, 2021.
- [26] I. Sklyar, A. Piunova, and Y. Liu, “Streaming multi-speaker ASR with RNN-T,” in *ICASSP*, 2021, pp. 6903–6907.
- [27] X. Chang, N. Moritz, T. Hori, S. Watanabe, and J. Le Roux, “Extended graph temporal classification for multi-speaker end-to-end ASR,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.00232*, 2022.
- [28] S. Watanabe, T. Hori, and J. R. Hershey, “Language independent end-to-end architecture for joint language identification and speech recognition,” in *ASRU*, 2017, pp. 265–271.
- [29] H. Inaguma *et al.*, “An end-to-end approach to joint social signal detection and automatic speech recognition,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2018, pp. 6214–6218.
- [30] L. El Shafey, H. Soltan, and I. Shafran, “Joint speech recognition and speaker diarization via sequence transduction,” in *Interspeech*, 2019, pp. 396–400.
- [31] Q. Zhang *et al.*, “Transformer transducer: A streamable speech recognition model with transformer encoders and RNN-T loss,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2020, pp. 7829–7833.
- [32] A. Graves, S. Fernández, F. Gomez, and J. Schmidhuber, “Connectionist temporal classification: labelling unsegmented sequence data with recurrent neural networks,” in *Proc. ICML*, 2006, pp. 369–376.
- [33] A. Graves, “Sequence transduction with recurrent neural networks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1211.3711*, 2012.
- [34] N. Kanda *et al.*, “Joint speaker counting, speech recognition, and speaker identification for overlapped speech of any number of speakers,” in *Interspeech*, 2020, pp. 36–40.
- [35] L. Lu, N. Kanda, J. Li, and Y. Gong, “Streaming multi-talker speech recognition with joint speaker identification,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.02109*, 2021.
- [36] L. Lu, J. Li, and Y. Gong, “Endpoint detection for streaming end-to-end multi-talker ASR,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.09979*, 2022.
- [37] I. Sklyar, A. Piunova, X. Zheng, and Y. Liu, “Multi-turn RNN-T for streaming recognition of multi-party speech,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.10200*, 2021.
- [38] V. Panayotov, G. Chen, D. Povey, and S. Khudanpur, “Librispeech: an ASR corpus based on public domain audio books,” in *ICASSP*, 2015, pp. 5206–5210.
- [39] M. McAuliffe, M. Socolof, S. Mihuc, M. Wagner, and M. Sonderegger, “Montreal forced aligner: Trainable text-speech alignment using Kaldi,” in *Interspeech*, 2017, pp. 498–502.
- [40] T. Ko *et al.*, “Audio augmentation for speech recognition,” in *Interspeech*, 2015, pp. 3586–3589.
- [41] D. S. Park *et al.*, “SpecAugment on large scale datasets,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2020, pp. 6879–6883.
- [42] X. Chen, Y. Wu, Z. Wang, S. Liu, and J. Li, “Developing real-time streaming transformer transducer for speech recognition on large-scale dataset,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2021, pp. 5904–5908.
- [43] J. Wu *et al.*, “Investigation of practical aspects of single channel speech separation for asr,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.01922*, 2021.
- [44] D. Raj, L. Lu, Z. Chen, Y. Gaur, and J. Li, “Continuous streaming multi-talker ASR with dual-path transducers,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.08555*, 2021.
- [45] J. G. Fiscus, J. Ajot, N. Radde, and C. Laprun, “Multiple dimension Levenshtein edit distance calculations for evaluating automatic speech recognition systems during simultaneous speech,” in *LREC*, 2006, pp. 803–808.
- [46] C. Wang *et al.*, “Semantic mask for transformer based end-to-end speech recognition,” in *Interspeech*, 2020, pp. 971–975.

## A. Generalized t-SOT for up to $M$ concurrent utterances

Our proposed algorithm to generate a serialized transcription for a training sample that includes up to  $M$  concurrent utterances is described in Algorithm 2. Here, we assume the transcription  $\mathcal{T}^+$  additionally contains a Boolean value  $b_i \in \{\text{True}, \text{False}\}$  that indicates whether  $w_i$  is the last token of an utterance or not (line 1). The utterance boundary can be defined based on the existence of silence region between two tokens from the same speaker, or can be defined semantically by a human transcriber. We sort  $\mathcal{T}^+$  in an ascending order of  $e_i$  (line 2) and initialize  $\mathcal{F}$  (line 3) as with Algorithm 1. We then introduce a speaker-to-channel dictionary  $\mathcal{D}$  and a set of unused channels  $\mathcal{C}$  to keep track of the used/unused channels (lines 4–5). During the iterative procedure (lines 6–17) for appending tokens one by one (line 13), an appropriate channel change token  $m$  is selected and inserted such that the same channel is not used by multiple speakers at the same time (lines 8–13). If the  $i$ -th token is the last token of the corresponding utterance (line 15), the channel used by speaker  $s_i$  is returned to  $\mathcal{C}$  (line 16) while being deleted from  $\mathcal{D}$  (line 17).

At the inference time, deserialization is conducted with the  $M$  virtual output channel, where the output channel is changed to  $m$  when  $\langle cc_m \rangle$  is recognized. Note that the first recognized token is always assigned to channel 1.

---

**Algorithm 2** Generating a serialized transcription for a training sample with up to  $M$  concurrent utterances

---

```

1: Given a speech sample with a time- and speaker-annotated transcription  $\mathcal{T}^+ = (w_i, e_i, s_i, b_i)_{i=1}^N$  where  $b_i \in \{\text{True}, \text{False}\}$  indicates if the  $w_i$  is the last token of an utterance or not.
2: Sort  $\mathcal{T}^+$  in ascending order of  $e_i$ .
3: Initialize a list of tokens  $\mathcal{W} \leftarrow [w_1]$ .
4: Initialize a speaker-to-channel dictionary  $\mathcal{D}[s_1] \leftarrow \langle cc_1 \rangle$ .
5: Initialize a set of unused channels  $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow \{\langle cc_2 \rangle, \dots, \langle cc_M \rangle\}$ .
6: for  $i$  in  $2, \dots, N$  do
7:   if  $s_i \neq s_{i-1}$  then
8:     if  $s_i \in \text{key\_of}(\mathcal{D})$  then
9:        $m \leftarrow \mathcal{D}[s_i]$ .
10:    else
11:       $m \leftarrow \text{pop}(\mathcal{C})$ .
12:      Add entry  $\mathcal{D}[s_i] \leftarrow m$ .
13:    Append  $m$  to  $\mathcal{W}$ .
14:    Append  $w_i$  to  $\mathcal{W}$ .
15:    if  $b_i$  is True then
16:       $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow \mathcal{C} \cup \{\mathcal{D}[s_i]\}$ .
17:      Delete entry  $\mathcal{D}[s_i]$ .
18: return  $\mathcal{W}$ 

```

---

## B. Using t-SOT for single-talker ASR

Table 5 shows the WER for LibriSpeechMix where we intentionally ignored  $\langle cc \rangle$  token at the time of inference with t-SOT models. We simply set zero for the output probability of  $\langle cc \rangle$  token. This evaluation was designed for the use case where we want to deploy a t-SOT model for both single- and multi-talker scenarios and we have prior knowledge that the input audio does not contain overlapping speech, which is possible in some applications. As shown in the table, if we ignore  $\langle cc \rangle$  token in inference, we achieved an improved WER for the single-talker (i.e. non-overlapping) evaluation set at the cost of severe degradation for the two-speaker-mixed evaluation set.

Table 5: WER (%) on LibriSpeechMix for single- and multi-talker models with different inference configurations. All models have 160 msec of algorithmic latency.

Model	Ignore $\langle cc \rangle$ in inference	Dev WER		Test WER	
		1spk	2spk	1spk	2spk
single-talker TT-18	-	4.3	63.2	4.5	63.7
t-SOT TT-18	yes	4.2	58.2	4.7	58.5
t-SOT TT-18	no	4.3	6.9	4.9	6.9
single-talker TT-36	-	3.9	62.9	4.4	63.3
t-SOT TT-36	yes	3.9	57.9	4.2	58.4
t-SOT TT-36	no	3.9	6.0	4.3	6.2

## C. Effect of beam size in inference

Table 6 shows the effect of beam size in the inference of t-SOT models based on LibriSpeechMix evaluation set. We observed that the large beam size such as 16 is especially important to achieve the best WER for overlapping speech. At the same time, we also observed the beam size of 4 or 8 already achieved a good WER, and the beam size is not necessary to be unrealistically large. Note that we used the beam size of 16 for all other experiments.

Table 6: Effect of the beam size in inference of t-SOT models. WERs (%) on LibriSpeechMix are shown. All models have 160 msec of algorithmic latency.

Model	Beam size	Dev WER		Test WER	
		1spk	2spk	1spk	2spk
t-SOT TT-18	1	4.7	8.2	5.2	8.3
t-SOT TT-18	2	4.4	7.6	5.0	7.6
t-SOT TT-18	4	4.3	7.1	4.9	7.2
t-SOT TT-18	8	4.3	6.9	4.9	7.0
t-SOT TT-18	16	4.3	6.9	4.9	6.9
t-SOT TT-36	1	4.1	7.0	4.6	7.1
t-SOT TT-36	2	4.0	6.5	4.5	6.8
t-SOT TT-36	4	3.9	6.3	4.3	6.4
t-SOT TT-36	8	3.9	6.1	4.3	6.2
t-SOT TT-36	16	3.9	6.0	4.3	6.2

## D. LibriCSS experiment with high algorithmic latency

Table 7 shows the evaluation result for LibriCSS based on t-SOT TT with different model configurations including one with high algorithmic latency of 2560 msec. As with the evaluation on LibriSpeechMix (Section 3.1.2), we observed a significant WER reduction by increasing algorithmic latency, and t-SOT TT-36 with 2560 msec of latency achieved SOTA results for all test conditions.

Table 7: WER (%) comparison on the monaural LibriCSS test set in the continuous input evaluation setting. A macro average of WERs is shown in the “Avg.” column.

Model	Latency (msec)	WER (%) for different overlap ratio						
		0L	0S	10	20	30	40	Avg.
t-SOT TT-18	160	7.5	7.5	8.5	10.5	12.6	14.0	10.1
t-SOT TT-36	160	6.7	6.1	7.5	9.3	11.6	12.9	9.0
t-SOT TT-36	2560	<b>5.4</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>11.3</b>	<b>7.6</b>