

Whisper-KDQ: A Lightweight Whisper via Guided Knowledge Distillation and Quantization for Efficient ASR

Hang Shao, Wei Wang, Bei Liu, Xun Gong, Haoyu Wang, Yanmin Qian[†]

MoE Key Lab of Artificial Intelligence, AI Institute
X-LANCE Lab, Department of Computer Science and Engineering
Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China

Abstract

Due to the rapid development of computing hardware resources and the dramatic growth of data, pre-trained models in speech recognition, such as Whisper, have significantly improved the performance of speech recognition tasks. However, these models usually have a high computational overhead, making it difficult to execute effectively on resource-constrained devices. To speed up inference and reduce model size while maintaining performance, we propose a novel guided knowledge distillation and quantization for large pre-trained model Whisper. The student model selects distillation and quantization layers based on quantization loss and distillation loss, respectively. We compressed Whisper_{small} to Whisper_{base} and Whisper_{tiny} levels, making Whisper_{small} 5.18x/10.48x smaller, respectively. Moreover, compared to the original Whisper_{base} and Whisper_{tiny}, there is also a relative character error rate (CER) reduction of 11.3% and 14.0% for the new compressed model respectively.

Index Terms: speech recognition, knowledge distillation, quantization, model compression, speech pre-training.

1. Introduction

Pre-training models on large amounts of data and then fine-tuning them on specific downstream tasks has emerged as a powerful approach for speech recognition. Several pre-trained audio encoders, such as Wav2vec [1], Wav2vec2.0 [2], and Hubert [3], have achieved impressive results in various ASR tasks. However, these encoders are trained in an unsupervised or self-supervised manner, and lack decoders with comparable performance for generating useful outputs. As a result, a fine-tuning phase is required to map these learned representations to the task at hand, which can be a complex process. While pre-training provides high-quality speech representations, the need for fine-tuning limits its practical usefulness and impact.

To solve this problem, Whisper [4], a Transformer based [5] encoder-decoder model, was trained on massive amounts of multilingual weakly supervised data and achieved high-quality recognition results on various benchmarks without fine-tuning on specific datasets. However, Whisper has a large number of parameters and long inference times, making it unsuitable for resource-constrained edge devices like mobile phones [6]. Recent studies [7, 8] have identified redundant parameters in pre-trained models, highlighting the need to reduce the model size and speed up inference while maintaining performance. The most commonly adopted approaches include knowledge distillation (KD) [9, 10, 11, 12], model quantization [13, 14, 15, 16], model structure pruning [17, 18, 19, 20], and parameter sharing [21].

Knowledge distillation (KD) is a technique that helps transfer knowledge from a large, teacher model to a smaller, student model by selecting appropriate representational information such as intermediate hidden layer features or output logits. This technique has been shown to be effective in various models, including DistilBERT [22] and TinyBERT [10]. Another popular technique for model compression is model quantization, which involves replacing high-precision parameters with low-precision parameters to reduce storage requirements and improve inference speed. Two primary methods for quantization are Post-training Quantization (PTQ) [13] and Quantization Aware Training (QAT) [23], with the latter being the focus of this paper. Model structure pruning is another technique that involves identifying redundant or unimportant parameters and removing them to reduce the number of model parameters and speed up inference. Pruning can be applied to various parts of the model, including entire layers [24], heads, intermediate dimensions [25], and blocks of the weight matrix [26]. Finally, parameter sharing is a technique that compresses the model by identifying parameters that can share weights. Transformer parameter sharing method has received much attention due to its outstanding performance and ease of implementation [27].

In this paper, we present a novel approach to compress the Whisper model for efficient inference on resource-constrained edge devices by combining knowledge distillation and model quantization. Our method selects optimal layers for distillation and quantization using mutual guidance between the two techniques. Specifically, the distillation layers are selected based on the quantization loss, while the quantization layers are selected based on the distillation loss. Our approach achieves significant compression on the Whisper model, reducing its size by 5.18x/10.48x from Whisper_{small} to Whisper_{base} and to Whisper_{tiny}, respectively. The compressed models exhibit a relative CER reduction of 11.3% and 14.0% for Whisper_{base} and Whisper_{tiny}, respectively, compared to their original counterparts. Our contributions can be summarized as follows: (1) We propose a method to compress the Whisper model for resource-constrained edge devices. (2) We propose three layer selection strategies for knowledge distillation and quantization. (3) We propose mutual guidance for distillation and quantization to restrain performance degradation during model compression.

2. Related Work

2.1. Pre-trained Model Whisper

Whisper model is trained with 680k hours of weakly supervised data, which are mainly derived from audio and text pairs on the Internet. Due to a large number of below-standard transcripts exist in the original dataset, several automatic filtering methods are also proposed to improve text quality. Because

arXiv:2305.10788v1 [cs.LG] 18 May 2023

[†]

the capability of large-scale supervised speech recognition pre-training is only studied, the general and widespread attention-based encoder-decoder (AED) architecture is used. The standard transformer layer in the AED architecture mainly contains two main sub-layers: multi-head attention (MHA) and fully connected feed-forward network (FFN).

$$\text{MHA}(W_Q, W_K, W_V) = \text{Concat}(\text{head}_{\{1, \dots, n\}})W_O, \quad (1)$$

$$\text{FFN}(H) = \text{GELU}(HW_1 + b_1)W_2 + b_2, \quad (2)$$

where $\text{head}_i = \text{attention}(W_Q^i, W_K^i, W_V^i)$ is the output of attention head i , W_O is a linear layer to transform the output after gathering and GELU [28] is an activation function. In this paper, we focus on quantifying W_Q, W_K, W_V, W_O and W_1, W_2 .

2.2. Knowledge Distillation

The purpose of knowledge distillation (KD) is to transfer knowledge from the large teacher model to the small student model, where the student model is trained to mimic the representation of the teacher model. Let R^T and R^S denote the representation functions of the teacher model and the student model, respectively. The goal of the representation function is to convert the network input into some information representation, which can be defined as the output of any layer in the network. During the distillation, the information in the intermediate hidden layer or the logits layer can be used as a representation function. Formally, KD can be modeled as minimizing the following objective function:

$$L_{KD} = \sum_{x \in X} L(R^T(x), R^S(x)), \quad (3)$$

where L is the loss function, in order to regularize the teacher and student representation function information.

3. Methodology

3.1. Transformer Distillation

The proposed transformer distillation is mainly divided into logits layer and intermediate hidden layer distillation. Both distillation methods are designed to make the student model better mimic the teacher model and thus transfer the knowledge to the student model.

3.1.1. Prediction Layer Distillation

The distillation of the prediction layer is mainly a regularization of the output of the student model and the teacher model, we use the prediction layer of the teacher model to fit the prediction layer of the student model so as to pull in the distance between them, where the loss of the distillation of the prediction layer is:

$$L_{pred} = \text{KLD}(z^T/t, z^S/t), \quad (4)$$

where z^T and z^S are the logits vectors predicted by the student and teacher respectively and t means the temperature value.

3.1.2. Intermediate Hidden Layer Distillation

Since Whisper has multiple transformer layers, we need to know which layers of the student model match which layers of the teacher model before the intermediate hidden layer distillation. Suppose the student network has M transformer layers and the teacher network has N transformer layers, where $N \geq M$. We need to select M layers from the N layers in the teacher network to correspond with the student network. Then

a function $N_j = f(M_i)$ is defined to match the layer M_i of the student network with the layer N_j of the teacher network, that is, the layer M_i of the student network learns the knowledge of the layer N_j of the teacher network. Formally, the student can acquire knowledge from the teacher by minimizing the following objective:

$$L_{hidn} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \lambda_i \text{MSE}(H_i^S, H_{f(i)}^T), \quad (5)$$

where H_i^S and $H_{f(i)}^T$ denote the hidden layer feature vectors of layer i and layer $f(i)$ of the student model and teacher model respectively, and λ_i is the hyper-parameter that represents the importance of the i -th layer's distillation. For the mapping function $f(i)$ there are the following three:

1. **static matching:** In this thesis we set to $f(i) = \lceil \frac{i \times N}{M} \rceil$.
2. **dynamic matching:** We select the layer $f(i)$ with the minimum MSE from the teacher model for each layer i of the student model.

$$f(i) = \arg \min_j \|W_A H_j^T - H_i^S\|^2, \quad (6)$$

where W_A is a linear transformation matrix.

3. **restrained dynamic matching:** On the basis of eq. (6) we restrict $f(i)$ to be a monotonically increasing function.




Figure 1: Three proposed mapping functions mentioned in Section 3.1.2 for intermediate hidden layer matching. Red denotes teacher layer and Green denotes the student layer.

3.2. Model Quantization

Model quantization aims to replace the parameters of the original model at full precision with parameters that take up less storage space at lower precision, such that the entire model takes up less space while inference is faster.

3.2.1. Uniform Quantization

For n -bit uniform quantization, the set of integers N that can be selected by the quantization matrix in the model is defined as:

$$N \in \{0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots, \pm 2^{n-1}\}, \quad (7)$$

For Transformer, we can construct a quantization table for each of its linear layers. For example, the l -th linear layer of the

model, the value range of the quantized parameter Q^l is shown as follows:

$$Q^l = \alpha^l N^l \in \left\{0, \pm\alpha^l, \dots, \pm\alpha^l (2^{n_l-1})\right\}, \quad (8)$$

where α^l represents the scaling factor of l -th layer, it flexibly scales the parameter coverage of the current layer after quantization according to the original parameters, n_l is the quantization precision number of l -th layer.

3.2.2. Additive Power-of-Two Quantization

In recent, [29] proposes Additive Powers-of-Two (APoT) quantization. In APoT quantization, each level is the sum of n Power-of-Two (PoT) terms as shown below in (9).

$$Q^l(\alpha^l, kn) = \gamma^l \times \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p_i \right\}, \quad (9)$$

where $p_i \in \left\{0, \frac{1}{2^i}, \frac{1}{2^{i+n}}, \dots, \frac{1}{2^{i+(2^k-2)n}}\right\}$, and γ^l is a scaling coefficient to make sure the maximum level in Q^l is α^l . k is called the base bit-width, which is the bit-width for each additive term, and n is the number of additive terms. The quantization operation is defined as:

$$g(W^l) = \arg \min_{Q^l} |W^l - Q^l|, \quad (10)$$

where g denotes the quantization operation. In the training session of the quantization model, the quantization parameter Q^l of the l -th layer should be as close as possible to the parameter W^l of the full-precision model of the l -th layer.

3.3. Distillation and Quantization Mutual Guidance Layer Selection

We further proposed a novel knowledge distillation and quantization (KDQ) mutually guided layer selection method. Since hidden layer requires the selection of suitable layers for distillation, we envision that the quantization loss can be used to guide the selection of distillation layers so that the layers suitable for quantization can be distilled from the teacher network. We define the quantization loss L_{quan} of layer l of the student network according to eq. (10) as follows:

$$L_{quan}^l = |W_S^l - Q_S^l| \approx |W_A W_T^{f(l)} - Q_S^l|, \quad (11)$$

where W_A and $f(l)$ are the same as eq. (6). W_S and Q_S are the weight of the student network before and after quantization, respectively. l denotes the l -th layer. Therefore, we guide the selection of distillation layers by quantization loss, defining the mapping function as follows:

$$f(i) = \arg \min_j |W_A W_T^j - Q_S^i|, \quad (12)$$

Meanwhile, we guide the selection of the quantization layer by distillation loss, which is obtained according to eq. (4) and eq. (5) as follows:

$$L_{kd}^l = L_{pred} + \beta L_{hidn}^l, \quad (13)$$

where L_{kd}^l denotes the distillation loss of the l -th layer of student model. We sorted $L_{kd} = \{L_{kd}^1, L_{kd}^2, \dots, L_{kd}^m\}$ set in increasing order and select the top 50% of layers and all layers for quantization, respectively.

Eventually, the joint distillation and quantization are trained together and the loss function for the whole model training as follows:

$$L_{model} = \alpha L_{kd} + \gamma L_{quan} + (1 - \alpha) CE(\hat{y}_s, y), \quad (14)$$

where \hat{y}_s and y are the output probability distribution of the student model and the label, respectively.

4. Experiments

4.1. Experiment Setup

Our training dataset is from the 500 hours CSJ [30], and the test set is from an 10 hours in-house Japanese (IHJ) test set and a subset of 3 CSJ test sets mixed together for 5 hours. Our Whisper teacher model mainly utilized Small version due to the limited GPU memory in our hardware setup, which consists of 12 encoder layers and 12 decoder layers with 3072 hidden units. Each encoder and decoder layer is a transformer block with 12 heads of 768 dimension self-attention [5]. The structure of the Base and Tiny models is shown in Table 1. We use an 80 dimensions log Mel-Frequency Cepstral Coefficient with 25ms window length computed every 10ms as inputs of audio encoder. SpecAugment [31] as a data augmentation policy is also used during model training. The Adam [32] optimizer is adopted with $3e-5$ initial learning rate and 10,000 warmup steps. In eq. (14) α is 0.5 and γ is 1.0. We use 8-bit quantization. Due to the limitations of GPU storage, we froze the parameters of encoder in the training process and trained only the decoder part. We use the same byte-level BPE text tokenizer used in GPT-2 [33, 34] for the multilingual models. All models are trained with in-house speech recognition toolkit Pytorch-asr until convergence.

Table 1: A detailed description of the architecture of the three scales of Whisper models used in this paper and their initial decoding results CER (%) on two test sets without any fine-tuning.

Model	Layers	Width	Heads	Size	CER (%)
Tiny	4	384	6	72MB	43.08/52.58
Base	6	512	8	139MB	34.88/48.70
Small	12	768	12	461MB	21.94/44.32

4.2. Experiment Results and Analysis

4.2.1. Results of knowledge distillation

In Table 2, the first row shows the result of direct inference of the teacher model Small without any fine-tuning, and the second and third rows show the result of direct inference and fine-tuning of the student model, i.e. Base and Tiny respectively. It can be observed that Whisper can also lead to a significant performance improvement after fine-tuning. This indicates that Whisper’s encoder has learned better representations, and after fine-tuning the decoder, it can map these learned representations to the corresponding downstream tasks.

Table 2’s third block illustrates the model compression with KD. The fourth row shows the distillation of the logits layer, while the following three lines indicate the addition of various layer matching methods. The compressed new model by KD logits (fourth row) exhibited a 7.7% and 10.2% relative CER reduction compared to the third row on Base and Tiny, respectively. Moreover, combining the compressed new model by KD logits with our proposed three hidden layer matching methods,

Table 2: CER (%), Model Size and Compression ratio comparison of different setups on CSJ corpus. *Logits* denotes distillation of only logits layer, and *uniform* indicates uniform quantization of all layers. The two numbers in this column of IHJ/CSJ are the CERs (%) of IHJ and CSJ test sets respectively. *Avg* indicates the averaged CER (%) on these two test sets. *Compres.* denotes the compression ratio compared to the teacher model. *Size* indicates the storage of the model on the disk. *Small* \rightarrow *Base/Tiny* means that *Small* is compressed to *Base* or *Tiny* size.

Method	Small \rightarrow Base			Small \rightarrow Tiny				
	IHJ/CSJ	Avg	Size	Compres.	IHJ/CSJ	Avg	Size	Compres.
1. Teacher w/o fine-tuning	21.94/44.32	33.13	461MB	1.0 \times	21.94/44.32	33.13	461MB	1.0 \times
2. Student w/o fine-tuning	34.88/48.70	41.79	139MB	3.32 \times	43.08/52.58	47.83	72MB	6.40 \times
3. + fine-tuning	29.07/39.10	34.09			35.05/42.17	38.61		
4. KD logits	25.04/37.87	31.46	139MB	3.32 \times	30.01/39.34	34.68	72MB	6.40 \times
5. + static matching	23.39/37.78	30.59			29.85/38.90	34.38		
6. + dynamic matching	24.53/38.87	31.70			30.39/38.94	34.67		
7. + restrained dynamic matching	23.24/36.54	29.89			29.23/37.99	33.61		
8. KDQ logits APoT-all	31.90/43.17	37.54	89MB	5.18 \times	43.16/46.37	44.77	44MB	10.48 \times
9. + static matching	31.18/42.24	36.71			42.98/44.23	43.61		
10. + dynamic matching	32.21/44.24	38.23			43.28/45.64	44.46		
11. + restrained dynamic matching	30.36/41.27	35.82			41.76/43.69	42.73		
12. KDQ logits APoT-top50%	29.17/42.36	35.77	114MB	4.04 \times	39.07/41.13	40.10	58MB	7.95 \times
13. + static matching	29.02/41.79	35.41			38.83/40.84	39.84		
14. + dynamic matching	30.24/42.63	36.44			39.24/42.01	40.63		
15. + restrained dynamic matching	28.79/40.03	34.41			37.95/39.67	38.81		
16. KDQ logits uniform	25.89/38.29	32.09	89MB	5.18\times	30.53/39.55	35.04	44MB	10.48\times
17. + static matching	24.37/38.22	31.30			30.39/39.22	34.81		
18. + dynamic matching	25.07/38.78	31.93			30.60/39.93	35.27		
19. + restrained dynamic matching	23.86/36.63	30.25			28.16/38.25	33.21		

such as static matching (fifth row), resulted in a relative CER reduction of 10.3% and 11.0% compared to the third row on Base and Tiny. These results demonstrate that the joint distillation of the logits layer and hidden layer enhances the student model’s learning ability.

However, this is not always the case, and some performance degradation may occur, for example, when dynamic matching is left unrestricted (sixth row). Because the distillation matching of the student model for the intermediate hidden layer picks the most matching layer by minimizing MSE with the teacher model, it may appear that the shallow layer of the student model learns the deep layer of the teacher model and the deep layer of the student model learns the shallow layer of the teacher model, which is obviously unreasonable. Therefore, we add a monotonically increasing restriction to the mapping function to avoid this situation.

4.2.2. Results of mutual guidance by APoT quantization and distillation

The fourth block in Table 2 shows the experimental results of quantizing the full decoder layer by KD and APoT quantization. Compared to the third row, our new model, after compressing through distilling logits and the restrained dynamic matching hidden layer, and quantizing the full decoder layer (eleventh row), obtained an absolute 1.73% and 4.12% CER performance degradation on Base and Tiny respectively. But we compressed the Base/Tiny model from 139MB/72MB to 89MB/44MB.

To mitigate the performance degradation brought by APoT quantization, we quantize by picking only 50% of the layers when selecting which layers to quantize, where the quantization layer selection strategy has been elaborated in Sec 3.3. The 5-th block in Table 2 shows the experimental results of quantizing 50% of the decoder layers by APoT quantization. It shows that

restrained dynamic matching Base and Tiny (fifteenth row) have almost no performance degradation compared to the third row, but we compressed the Base/Tiny model from 139MB/72MB to 114MB/58MB, respectively. This proves that we can achieve the purpose of mitigating the performance degradation from model quantization by picking the right layers to quantize. For the case of large performance degradation of APoT quantization, we speculate that it may be that this non-uniform quantization impairs the attention of the MHA of the transformer.

4.2.3. Results of mutual guidance by uniform quantization and distillation

The last block of Table 2 shows the results of KD and uniform quantization, where we quantize all layers of the student model in decoder. Compared to the third row, the best results of our new compressed model on Base and Tiny (nineteenth row) obtained a relative CER reduction of 11.3% and 14.0%, compressing the model from 139MB/72MB to 89MB/44MB, which means improving the compression ratio from 3.32x/6.40x to 5.18x/10.48x, respectively. Moreover, compared to the teacher model (first row), we compressed it from 461 MB to 89 MB and 44 MB, i.e., 5.18 times and 10.48 times smaller, respectively. It is demonstrated that our method is effective in compressing large models to small models.

5. Conclusions

In this paper, in order to solve the problem that the model size of the current pre-training model Whisper is too large and not convenient to use, we propose a knowledge distillation and quantization mutual guidance layer selection method for compressing the model, and also propose three matching methods for the intermediate hidden layer of the student model and the teacher model during knowledge distillation. Finally, on the Japanese

CSJ dataset, our approach achieves significant compression on the Whisper model, reducing its size by 5.18x/10.48x from Whisper_{small} to Whisper_{base} and to Whisper_{tiny}, respectively. The compressed models exhibit a relative CER reduction of 11.3% and 14.0% for Whisper_{base} and Whisper_{tiny}, respectively, compared to their original counterparts.

6. References

- [1] S. Schneider, A. Baevski, R. Collobert, and M. Auli, “wav2vec: Unsupervised pre-training for speech recognition,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.05862*, 2019.
- [2] A. Baevski, Y. Zhou, A. Mohamed, and M. Auli, “wav2vec 2.0: A framework for self-supervised learning of speech representations,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 33, pp. 12 449–12 460, 2020.
- [3] W.-N. Hsu, B. Bolte, Y.-H. H. Tsai, K. Lakhota, R. Salakhutdinov, and A. Mohamed, “Hubert: Self-supervised speech representation learning by masked prediction of hidden units,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 29, pp. 3451–3460, 2021.
- [4] A. Radford, J. W. Kim, T. Xu, G. Brockman, C. McLeavey, and I. Sutskever, “Robust speech recognition via large-scale weak supervision,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.04356*, 2022.
- [5] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, Ł. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin, “Attention is all you need,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [6] A. Hannun, “The history of speech recognition to the year 2030,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.00084*, 2021.
- [7] E. Voita, D. Talbot, F. Moiseev, R. Sennrich, and I. Titov, “Analyzing multi-head self-attention: Specialized heads do the heavy lifting, the rest can be pruned,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.09418*, 2019.
- [8] P. Michel, O. Levy, and G. Neubig, “Are sixteen heads really better than one?” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 32, 2019.
- [9] H.-J. Chang, S.-w. Yang, and H.-y. Lee, “Distilhubert: Speech representation learning by layer-wise distillation of hidden-unit bert,” in *ICASSP 2022-2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 7087–7091.
- [10] X. Jiao, Y. Yin, L. Shang, X. Jiang, X. Chen, L. Li, F. Wang, and Q. Liu, “TinyBERT: Distilling BERT for natural language understanding,” in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2020, pp. 4163–4174. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2020.findings-emnlp.372>
- [11] A. Romero, N. Ballas, S. E. Kahou, A. Chassang, C. Gatta, and Y. Bengio, “Fitnets: Hints for thin deep nets,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6550*, 2014.
- [12] X. Gong, Z. Zhou, and Y. Qian, “Knowledge Transfer and Distillation from Autoregressive to Non-Autoregressive Speech Recognition,” in *Proc. Interspeech 2022*, 2022, pp. 2618–2622.
- [13] Z. Liu, Y. Wang, K. Han, W. Zhang, S. Ma, and W. Gao, “Post-training quantization for vision transformer,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 34, pp. 28 092–28 103, 2021.
- [14] Y. Gong, L. Liu, M. Yang, and L. Bourdev, “Compressing deep convolutional networks using vector quantization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6115*, 2014.
- [15] D. Lin, S. Talathi, and S. Annapureddy, “Fixed point quantization of deep convolutional networks,” in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2016, pp. 2849–2858.
- [16] D. Zhang, J. Yang, D. Ye, and G. Hua, “Lq-nets: Learned quantization for highly accurate and compact deep neural networks,” in *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, 2018, pp. 365–382.
- [17] R. Wang, Q. Bai, J. Ao, L. Zhou, Z. Xiong, Z. Wei, Y. Zhang, T. Ko, and H. Li, “Lighthubert: Lightweight and configurable speech representation learning with once-for-all hidden-unit bert,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.15610*, 2022.
- [18] M. Xia, Z. Zhong, and D. Chen, “Structured pruning learns compact and accurate models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.00408*, 2022.
- [19] Z. Liu, M. Sun, T. Zhou, G. Huang, and T. Darrell, “Rethinking the value of network pruning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.05270*, 2018.
- [20] J. Frankle and M. Carbin, “The lottery ticket hypothesis: Finding sparse, trainable neural networks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.03635*, 2018.
- [21] D.-H. Kim, J.-H. Lee, J.-H. Mo, and J.-H. Chang, “W2v2-light: A lightweight version of wav2vec 2.0 for automatic speech recognition,” in *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, INTERSPEECH*, vol. 2022. International Speech Communication Association, 2022, pp. 3038–3042.
- [22] V. Sanh, L. Debut, J. Chaumond, and T. Wolf, “Distilbert, a distilled version of bert: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.01108*, 2019.
- [23] S. A. Taylor, J. Fernandez-Marques, and N. D. Lane, “Degree-quant: Quantization-aware training for graph neural networks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.05000*, 2020.
- [24] H. Sajjad, F. Dalvi, N. Durrani, and P. Nakov, “Poor man’s bert: Smaller and faster transformer models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.03844*, vol. 2, no. 2, 2020.
- [25] Z. Wang, J. Wohlwend, and T. Lei, “Structured pruning of large language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.04732*, 2019.
- [26] F. Lagunas, E. Charlaix, V. Sanh, and A. M. Rush, “Block pruning for faster transformers,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.04838*, 2021.
- [27] S. Bai, J. Z. Kolter, and V. Koltun, “Deep equilibrium models,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 32, 2019.
- [28] D. Hendrycks and K. Gimpel, “Gaussian error linear units (gelus),” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.08415*, 2016.
- [29] Y. Li, X. Dong, and W. Wang, “Additive powers-of-two quantization: An efficient non-uniform discretization for neural networks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.13144*, 2019.
- [30] K. Maekawa, “Corpus of spontaneous japanese: Its design and evaluation,” in *ISCA & IEEE Workshop on Spontaneous Speech Processing and Recognition*, 2003.
- [31] D. S. Park, W. Chan, Y. Zhang, C.-C. Chiu, B. Zoph, E. D. Cubuk, and Q. V. Le, “SpecAugment: A simple data augmentation method for automatic speech recognition,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.08779*, 2019.
- [32] D. P. Kingma and J. Ba, “Adam: A method for stochastic optimization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.
- [33] A. Radford, J. Wu, R. Child, D. Luan, D. Amodei, I. Sutskever *et al.*, “Language models are unsupervised multitask learners,” *OpenAI blog*, vol. 1, no. 8, p. 9, 2019.
- [34] R. Sennrich, B. Haddow, and A. Birch, “Neural machine translation of rare words with subword units,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.07909*, 2015.