

THE PIPELINE SYSTEM OF ASR AND NLU WITH MLM-BASED DATA AUGMENTATION TOWARD STOP LOW-RESOURCE CHALLENGE

Hayato Futami¹, Jessica Huynh², Siddhant Arora², Shih-Lun Wu², Yosuke Kashiwagi¹,
Yifan Peng², Brian Yan², Emiru Tsunoo¹, Shinji Watanabe²

¹Sony Group Corporation, Japan ²Carnegie Mellon University, USA

ABSTRACT

This paper describes our system for the low-resource domain adaptation track (Track 3) in Spoken Language Understanding Grand Challenge, which is a part of ICASSP Signal Processing Grand Challenge 2023. In the track, we adopt a pipeline approach of ASR and NLU. For ASR, we fine-tune Whisper for each domain with upsampling. For NLU, we fine-tune BART on all the Track3 data and then on low-resource domain data. We apply masked LM (MLM)-based data augmentation, where some of input tokens and corresponding target labels are replaced using MLM. We also apply a retrieval-based approach, where model input is augmented with similar training samples. As a result, we achieved exact match (EM) accuracy 63.3/75.0 (average: 69.15) for reminder/weather domain, and won **the 1st place** at the challenge.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the Spoken Language Understanding Grand Challenge at ICASSP 2023, we aim to predict user’s intents, slots types and values from audio, known as spoken language understanding (SLU), using the STOP [1] dataset. The dataset is created by adding audio recordings to TOPv2 [2] dataset. It consists of 8 domains: alarm, event, messaging, music, navigation, timer, reminder, and weather. For Track 3, we address low-resource domain adaptation. The number of training samples for reminder/weather are limited to 482/162, which ensures at least 25 samples are included for each intent and slot type. We can use held-in (6 domains) and low-resource data (reminder/weather), which we call “Track3 data”.

We adopt a pipeline approach for Track 3. An ASR model generates transcripts from audio, and then an NLU model converts transcripts into semantic parse results. This approach fully benefits from both powerful pre-trained ASR and LM, which is especially important in this low-resource setting. For ASR, we fine-tuned Whisper [3] on the STOP dataset for Track 3. We built two individual models for each target domain: one was fine-tuned on held-in and reminder data, and the other was fine-tuned on held-in and weather data. As low-resource data was much smaller than held-in data, they were upsampled by 20 times. For NLU, we applied two-step fine-tuning. First, we fine-tuned BART on all the Track3

Table 1: Example of data augmentation.

x :	how ’ s the weather in sydney
y :	[in:get_weather [sl:location sydney]]
x_{mask} :	how ’ s the weather in [MASK]
x_{aug} :	how ’ s the weather in london
y_{aug} :	[in:get_weather [sl:location london]]

data. Then, we fine-tuned it on each low-resource domain (reminder/weather) data to build two models. During low-resource fine-tuning, we applied masked LM (MLM)-based data augmentation. We also retrieved related training samples for an additional model input, which is known as retrieval augmentation [4].

2. AUGMENTATIONS FOR NLU

2.1. MLM-based data augmentation

Since low-resource sets have limited samples for training, its diversity would not be enough and prone to overfit. To solve the issue, we apply masked LM (MLM)-based data augmentation. Let x denote an input transcript and y denote a target semantic parse. The data augmentation procedure is:

1. Some portion ($p \sim U(0, 0.2)$) of tokens in x are randomly masked to make x_{mask} .
2. The masked tokens are replaced with MLM’s predictions to make x_{aug} .
3. In case the original tokens before masking exist in y (as slot values), they are also replaced to make y_{aug} .

Table 1 shows an example of data augmentation. We sometimes get $(x_{\text{aug}}, y_{\text{aug}})$ that is grammatically incorrect or does not fit to intent and slot types. We filter out samples that cannot be exactly inferred by an NLU model once trained on the original data. Similar data augmentation is done at [5], but ours does not require any fine-tuning for a generator MLM.

2.2. Retrieval augmentation

We follow [4], which shows the effectiveness of retrieval augmentation in low-resource domain adaptation on TOPv2

Table 2: ASR performance of STOP dataset.

	Valid/Test WER[%]	
	reminder	weather
Whisper	2.5/3.7	4.1/2.9
+ FT	1.7/2.8	3.4/2.3

dataset. We add $k = 4$ input–output pairs as exemplars to \mathbf{x} :

$$\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{x}_1; \mathbf{y}_1; \dots; \mathbf{x}_4; \mathbf{y}_4$$

These exemplars are selected from Track3 training data, based on TF-IDF similarity score. We only consider input similarity between \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{x}_i , for simplicity. During training, exemplars are sampled over geometric distribution, where r -ranked samples are selected with a probability of $p(1-p)^{r-1}$ ($p = 0.1$).

3. EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATIONS

For ASR, we fine-tuned Whisper model ¹ using ESPnet ² framework. We fine-tuned it for each domain, on the mixture of held-in data and 20x upsampled low-resource domain data. We applied speed perturbation, SpecAugment, and label smoothing ($p = 0.1$). We averaged 10-best checkpoints based on validation set. Table 2 shows the ASR results. With fine-tuning (FT), the WERs were observed to be improved. All the words were lowercased in both ASR and NLU.

For NLU, we fine-tuned BART model ³ using Transformers ⁴ framework. To solve NLU, intent and slot tags (e.g. [in:get_weather]) were added to the original BART vocabulary. Table 3 shows the NLU results, where all the evaluation is done using ground-truth text as model input. We first fine-tuned BART on all the Track3 data, and then fine-tuned it on low-resource data, which we call low-resource fine-tuning (LR-FT). By adding LR-FT, the EM (exact match) accuracy was improved. As described in Section 2.1, we applied data augmentation with BERT ⁵ during LR-FT. We prepared 3241/881 synthetic samples, and 1841/530 samples remained after filtering. We found data augmentation improved the EM accuracy. We further applied retrieval augmentation to BART (RA-BART), as described in Section 2.2. They are also fine-tuned in two steps (all + reminder/weather). With combination of data augmentation and retrieval, the EM score was further improved to 73.8/79.7 (average: 76.8). Note that we must apply the same methodology for both low-resource domains, so we selected the model of the best averaged EM accuracy on validation set.

Our target is to predict semantic parse from audio. Table 4 shows the end-to-end SLU evaluation with our ASR

¹<https://huggingface.co/openai/whisper-medium>

²<https://github.com/espnet/espnet>

³<https://huggingface.co/facebook/bart-large>

⁴<https://github.com/huggingface/transformers>

⁵<https://huggingface.co/bert-base-uncased>

Table 3: NLU performance from **ground-truth** text.

	Valid/Test EM Acc.[%]	
	reminder	weather
BART	41.3/45.1	39.1/65.1
+ LR-FT	68.2/67.5	76.7/79.7
+ LR-FT (dataaug)	68.2/69.9	78.9/80.3
RA-BART +LR-FT	66.7/70.3	81.2/80.3
+ LR-FT (dataaug)	69.7/73.8	80.5/79.7

Table 4: SLU evaluation from **audio**, which is the target of the challenge.

	Test EM Acc.[%]		
	reminder	weather	Avg.
Our pipeline	63.3	75.0	69.15
E2E SLU [1]	15.38	46.77	31.08

and NLU. We achieved the EM accuracy **63.3/75.0** (average: **69.15**). Our pipeline was confirmed to be much better than the E2E SLU baseline [1].

4. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work used Bridges2 system at PSC and Delta system at NCSA through allocation CIS210014 from the Advanced Cyberinfrastructure Coordination Ecosystem: Services & Support (ACCESS) program, which is supported by National Science Foundation grants #2138259, #2138286, #2138307, #2137603, and #2138296. Jessica Huynh was supported by the NSF Graduate Research Fellowship under Grant Nos. DGE1745016 and DGE2140739. The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect those of that funding agency.

5. REFERENCES

- [1] Paden Tomasello et al., “STOP: A dataset for spoken task oriented semantic parsing,” *SLT*, pp. 991–998, 2022.
- [2] Xilun Chen et al., “Low-resource domain adaptation for compositional task-oriented semantic parsing,” in *EMNLP*, 2020, pp. 5090–5100.
- [3] Alec Radford et al., “Robust speech recognition via large-scale weak supervision,” *arXiv*, 2022.
- [4] Yury Zemlyanskiy et al., “Generate-and-retrieve: Use your predictions to improve retrieval for semantic parsing,” in *COLING*, 2022, pp. 4946–4951.
- [5] Ke Tran et al., “Generating synthetic data for task-oriented semantic parsing with hierarchical representations,” in *SPNLP*, 2020, pp. 17–21.