Adaptable Multi-Domain Language Model for Transformer ASR

Taewoo Lee¹, Min-Joong Lee², Tae Gyoon Kang², Seokyeoung Jung¹, Minseok Kwon¹, Yeona Hong¹, Jungin Lee¹, Kyoung-Gu Woo¹, Ho-Gyeong Kim², Jiseung Jeong², Jihyun Lee², Hosik Lee², Young Sang Choi² ¹AI R&D Group, ²Samsung Advanced Institute of Technology, Samsung Electronics, South Korea {tw1.lee, minjoong.lee, taeg.kang, jihyun.s.lee}@samsung.com

Abstract

We propose an adapter based multi-domain Transformer based language model (LM) for Transformer ASR. The model consists of a big size common LM and small size adapters. The model can perform multi-domain adaptation with only the small size adapters and its related layers. The proposed model can reuse the full fine-tuned LM which is fine-tuned using all layers of an original model. The proposed LM can be expanded to new domains by adding about 2% of parameters for a first domain and 13% parameters for after second domain. The proposed model is also effective in reducing the model maintenance cost because it is possible to omit the costly and time-consuming common LM pre-training process. Using proposed adapter based approach, we observed that a general LM with adapter can outperform a dedicated music domain LM in terms of word error rate (WER).

1. Motivation

- Catastrophic Forgetting Problem
- knowledge learned from previous training data disappears from the model when data is sequentially trained in a neural network.
- One simple way to avoid this problem is that to retrain the model from scratch with the newly added data.
 - Drawback : Inefficiency. It takes too long time to pre-train the model.

4. Data Set

- Training Data
- The General LM : anonymized 24GB normalized Korean text data consisting of 353M utterances.
- The Music LM : normalized Korean text data consisting of 45M utterances
- Test Data

	Domain	# Utterances	Contents
	In	50K	Bixby use-case scenario
General		017	Domain specific utterances. Especially, dom
LM	Out	8K	ains having its own unique proper nouns suc
			h as hospital or doctor's names.
Music	In	610	Well known song titles and singer names.
LM	Out	3709	Newly added song titles and singer names.



Fig. 2. layers.

model.

2. Previous Study (Adapter in NLP)



Like Resnet block, an adapter module consists of two feedforward layers and one RELU layer like

Like Fig 1. The adapter modules are added twice to each Transformer layer. One is added after the projection following multi headed attention and another one is added after two feed forward

During adapter tuning, the green layers are trained on the downstream data. These layers include the adapter, layer normalization parameters, and final classification layer.

However, layer structures are slightly different between NLP and ASR Transformers.

7. Conclusion

1. It can greatly save the number of model parameters.

2. It is possible to prevent common layers from forgetting previously learned knowledge.

Since you don't have to train the model from scratch, you can save time to train (adapt) the

			3.
	•		•
Softmax	Softmax		↑
Linear	Linear ₁ ··· Li	near _{Nd}	
Layer Norm		LN _{Nd} Layer	
	$Adapter_1 \cdots Ad$	apter _{Nd}	
2x Feed-forward	2x Feed-forwar	rd Feed-1	forward roject
Layer Norm	LN_1 (LN _{Nd} Nonli	nearity
•	$\times N$ $Adapter_1 \cdots Ad$	$apter_{N_d}$ × N	
Multi-Head Attention	Multi-Head		
	$V \uparrow K \uparrow Q$	feed-f	orward project
Layer Norm	LN_1		
	ng	Positional Encoding	·/
Embedding	Embedding	g Transformer	•
Ι	• •	~)	
	FI	g. 3	
	5	. Experiment	1
Tahla 1 W/FRs c	5 f E2E E2E-G-	. Experiment	1 M-A on Genera
Table 1. WERs c	5 of E2E, E2E-G-	LM, and E2E-G-L	1 M-A on Genera
Table 1. WERs c TC In-Dom	5 of E2E, E2E-G- E2E ain 2.42	LM, and E2E-G-L E2E-G-LM 1.82	1 .M–A on Genera <u>E2E–G–LM–A</u> 1.69
Table 1. WERs c TC In-Dom Out-Dor	5 of E2E, E2E-G- E2E ain 2.42 nain 10.62	LM, and E2E-G-L E2E-G-LM 1.82 8.18	1 M-A on Genera E2E-G-LM-A 1.69 2.84
Table 1. WERs c TC In-Dom Out-Dor Table 2. WERs c	5 of E2E, E2E-G- E2E ain 2.42 nain 10.62	LM, and E2E-G-LM E2E-G-LM 1.82 8.18	1 M-A on Genera <u>E2E-G-LM-A</u> <u>1.69</u> <u>2.84</u>
Table 1. WERs c <u>TC</u> In–Dom Out–Dor Table 2. WERs c TC	5 of E2E, E2E-G- E2E ain 2.42 nain 10.62 of E2E, E2E-M- E2E	LM, and E2E-G-LM E2E-G-LM 1.82 8.18 LM, and E2E-M-L E2E-M-LM	1 M–A on Genera <u>E2E–G–LM–A</u> 1.69 2.84 .M–A on Music E2E–M–LM–A
Table 1. WERs c TC In-Dom Out-Dor Table 2. WERs c TC In-Dom	5 of E2E, E2E-G- E2E ain 2.42 nain 10.62 of E2E, E2E-M- E2E ain 8.2	LM, and E2E-G-LM E2E-G-LM 1.82 8.18 LM, and E2E-M-L E2E-M-LM 2.68	1 M–A on Genera <u>E2E–G–LM–A</u> 1.69 2.84 .M–A on Music <u>E2E–M–LM–A</u> 2.46
Table 1. WERs of TC In-Dom Out-Dor Table 2. WERs of TC In-Dom Out-Dom	5 of E2E, E2E-G- E2E ain 2.42 nain 10.62 of E2E, E2E-M- E2E ain 8.2 nain 12.66	. Experiment LM, and E2E-G-LM <u>E2E-G-LM</u> 1.82 8.18 LM, and E2E-M-L <u>E2E-M-LM</u> 2.68 5.43	1 M–A on Genera E2E–G–LM–A 1.69 2.84 .M–A on Music E2E–M–LM–A 2.46 4.13
Table 1. WERs c TC In-Dom Out-Dom Table 2. WERs c TC In-Dom Out-Dom Out-Dom Out-Dom	5 of E2E, E2E-G- E2E ain 2.42 nain 10.62 of E2E, E2E-M- E2E ain 8.2 nain 12.66	LM, and E2E-G-LM E2E-G-LM 1.82 8.18 LM, and E2E-M-L E2E-M-LM 2.68 5.43 ter fine-tuning wit	1 M–A on Genera E2E–G–LM–A 1.69 2.84 M–A on Music E2E–M–LM–A 2.46 4.13 h M–LM–A on N
Table 1. WERs of TC In-Dom Out-Dor Table 2. WERs of TC In-Dom Out-Don Out-Don Table 3. WERs of TC	5 of E2E, E2E-G- E2E ain 2.42 nain 10.62 of E2E, E2E-M- E2E ain 8.2 nain 12.66 of iterative adap E2E-M-LM	LM, and E2E-G-L E2E-G-LM 1.82 8.18 LM, and E2E-M-L E2E-M-LM 2.68 5.43 ter fine-tuning wit M1 _{iter1} M1 _{ite}	1 M–A on Genera <u>E2E–G–LM–A</u> 1.69 2.84 M–A on Music <u>E2E–M–LM–A</u> 2.46 4.13 h M–LM–A on N -2 M1 _{iter3}
Table 1. WERs c TC In-Dom Out-Dor Table 2. WERs c TC In-Dom Out-Don Out-Don Out-Don	5 of E2E, E2E-G- E2E ain 2.42 nain 10.62 of E2E, E2E-M- E2E ain 8.2 nain 12.66 of iterative adap E2E-M-LM 2.68	Experiment LM, and E2E-G-LM E2E-G-LM 1.82 8.18 LM, and E2E-M-LM 2.68 5.43 ter fine-tuning wit M1 _{iter1} M1 _{iter1} 2.46 1.97 4.12 2.00	1 M–A on Genera E2E–G–LM–A 1.69 2.84 .M–A on Music E2E–M–LM–A 2.46 4.13 h M–LM–A on N 2.46 4.13

C
U

TC	E2E-M-L M	.E2E-M-L M-A	.E2E-G-L M	E2E-G-L M -A _{iter1}	E2E-G-LE M -A _{iter2}	E2E-G-L M -A _{iter3}	WERR (E2E-G-LM- A _{iter3} – E2E- M-LM)	WERR (E2E-G-LM- A _{iter3} – E2E- M-LM-A)
In- Domain	2.68	2.46	4.65	3.82	2.38	2.19	-0.49	-0.27
Out- Domain	5.43	4.13	11.27	5.75	4.75	4.60	-0.83	0.47



oposed Method

- odel Architecture
- the adapter is added.
- existing Transformer LM layers.
- e trained for the target domain data.
- ody as it is.

E, E2E-G-LM,	and E2E-G-L	M-A on Genera	al Domain T(Cs
E2E	E2E-G-LM	E2E-G-LM-A		
2 12	1.82	1 69		

nain TCs

ic Domain TCs

6. Experiment 2

- improvement.

- also be used as a music LM.
- adapter.

Paper ID: 1298

SAMSUNG

The figure on the left is the structure of Transformer LM before

The figure in the middle is the structure of the proposed Transformer multi-domain LM. As shown in the figure, the proposed method is made by adding adapter modules to the

Finally, the figure on the right is the added adapter module.

hen learning a small amount of new data for each domain, only e adapter, layer normalization, and linear layers indicated in green

ven when the domain is expanded, only the adapter-related layers n be branched while leaving the layer corresponding to the large

> • Table 1 shows how far the recognition rate can be improved when an adapter is applied to a given General LM. By adding an adapter to the LM and further adapting the error sentences obtained from the decoding result, we could get an additional recognition rate improvement over the recognition rate of the already best tuned base model. In particular, out-domain TCs, which included a lot of unique proper nouns, showed a greater

• Table 2 shows the experimental results for Music LM. As in Table 1, similar results were observed for Music LM. Table 3 shows how much the recognition rate can be improved by iterative adapter training. Iterative adapter training refers to a method of repeating the process of training adapter-related layers by extracting error sentences from the decoded result. We have confirmed that the recognition rate is improved up to 3 times, and we were able to further improve the error for a given TC.

• Table 4 shows whether the general LM with adapter can

• Music domain TC was used in this experiment.

• Looking at the results in the blue box on the left, you can see that the WERs of the music LM and the music LM with adapter are better than the result of using the general LM. However, if you add an adapter to General LM and repeat iterative adapter training, you can see that you can finally get a lower WER than music LM. Also, you can get lower WER in in-domain than music LM with