

# TDT-KWS: FAST AND ACCURATE KEYWORD SPOTTING USING TOKEN-AND-DURATION TRANSDUCER

Yu Xi<sup>1</sup>, Hao Li<sup>2</sup>, Baochen Yang<sup>1</sup>, Haoyu Li<sup>1</sup>, Hainan Xu<sup>3</sup>, †Kai Yu<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>MoE Key Lab of Artificial Intelligence, AI Institute, X-LANCE Lab, Shanghai Jiao Tong University

<sup>2</sup>AISpeech Ltd, Suzhou, China

<sup>3</sup>NVIDIA, U.S.A.

## ABSTRACT

Designing an efficient keyword spotting (KWS) system that delivers exceptional performance on resource-constrained edge devices has long been a subject of significant attention. Existing KWS search algorithms typically follow a *frame-synchronous* approach, where search decisions are made repeatedly at each frame despite the fact that most frames are keyword-irrelevant. In this paper, we propose TDT-KWS, which leverages token-and-duration Transducers (TDT) for KWS tasks. We also propose a novel KWS task-specific decoding algorithm for Transducer-based models, which supports highly effective *frame-asynchronous* keyword search in streaming speech scenarios. With evaluations conducted on both the public Hey Snips and self-constructed LibriKWS-20 datasets, our proposed KWS-decoding algorithm produces more accurate results than conventional ASR decoding algorithms. Additionally, TDT-KWS achieves on-par or better wake word detection performance than both RNN-T and traditional TDT-ASR systems while achieving significant inference speed-up. Furthermore, experiments show that TDT-KWS is more robust to noisy environments compared to RNN-T KWS.

**Index Terms**— Transducer, fixed keyword spotting, acceleration, on-device, continuous speech

## 1. INTRODUCTION

*Keyword spotting* (KWS) is the task of detecting predefined keywords within streaming audio [1]. Due to the rapid development of the Internet of Things (IoT) and intelligent cockpits, KWS systems, in particular *wake word detection* (WWD) systems, are now widely used in various aspects of our daily lives [2]. In order to provide a seamless human-machine interaction experience, it is essential to find the right balance between minimizing false alarms, maximizing recall (the ability to detect the keywords correctly), and ensuring low computational burden for small-footprint KWS.

In recent years, RNN-T [3], also known as Transducers, has achieved great success in automatic speech recognition (ASR) [4, 5, 6, 7, 8], speech translation (ST) [9], and KWS [10, 11, 12, 13, 14]. Since WWD models are typically deployed on edge devices, it is necessary to design a lightweight neural network to account for the limited computational and storage resources. *Tiny Transducer* [15], a phoneme-based Transducer, is proposed to address the problem of on-device streaming speech recognition. It consists of deep feed-forward sequential memory network (DFSMN) [16] blocks as the Transducer encoder, a stateless network as the predictor, and a linear layer as the joiner to reduce the network’s parameters. Subsequent

work on small-footprint WWD [12] and CaTT-KWS [14] both follow the same network architecture as Tiny Transducer. In this paper, we follow part of the Tiny Transducer’s configuration as well.

Despite their superior performance, the auto-regressive decoding of Transducers is computationally intensive and can introduce significant computational latency, especially for tasks like KWS running under limited hardware resources. Recently, *Token-and-Duration Transducer* (TDT) [17] is proposed to alleviate this issue by jointly predicting a token and its duration. TDT achieves better performance and significant inference speed-up compared to the original RNN-Ts in a number of sequence modeling tasks. The refined design and advantages of the TDT model make it suitable for Transducer-related KWS systems, which is the focus of this paper.

Note, that there is a straightforward method to perform KWS with a Transducer model, by simply running conventional ASR decoding on the audio sequence, and then checking if the keyword is in the decoding output. To our best knowledge, all existing Transducer-based KWS systems [10, 11, 12, 13, 14] follow this approach. However, this use of Transducers for KWS is not optimal or efficient, since in conventional ASR decoding, the search space is not constrained to the specified keyword, and the search algorithm is not tailored to KWS tasks. In this paper, we propose a novel *KWS decoding algorithm* specifically designed for KWS tasks, which constrains the search space for fixed keywords and can fully realize the potential of TDT for KWS. This paper makes the following contributions:


- We propose a novel KWS decoding algorithm that dynamically detects the start of keywords for Transducers in streaming continuous speech. The proposed algorithm can obtain better KWS performance compared to conventional ASR decoding algorithms.
- We propose TDT-KWS, which achieves comparable or better performance on the open-source KWS dataset “Hey Snips” [18] and our self-constructed LibriKWS-20 dataset derived from LibriSpeech [19] compared to conventional RNN-T KWS, while running an additional 2-4 times faster during inference.
- TDT-KWS demonstrates greater robustness than conventional RNN-T systems in low signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) environments, which is crucial for KWS to reduce false alarms in extreme environments.

## 2. TDT BASED KEYWORD SPOTTING

### 2.1. Transducers

A Transducer consists of an encoder, a predictor, and a joiner (or a joint network). The encoder takes acoustic features as input, captur-

†Kai Yu is the corresponding author.



**Fig. 1.** Decoding path for RNN-T KWS System. Each node  $(t, u)$  represents the highest score obtained by outputting the first  $u$  elements of the keyword up to time  $t$ . The horizontal arrow originating from node  $(t, u)$  indicates the probability  $\phi(t, u)$  of outputting blank. The vertical arrow represents the probability  $y(t, u)$  of outputting the  $(u + 1)$ -th element of the keyword at time  $t$ . To identify the optimal path for the keyword at time  $t$ , the path with the maximum score is illustrated by red arrows. This path corresponds to the most probable sequence of the keyword at time  $t$ .

ing the acoustic properties of the speech signal. On the other hand, the decoder accepts text input, typically in the form of linguistic units such as phonemes, graphemes, or sub-words. The higher-level representations obtained from these two modules are then merged and fed into the joiner, which generates a probability distribution  $P(v|t, u)$ , where  $v$  can be any token in the vocabulary or a special blank symbol  $\phi$ , and  $t, u$  refer to indices to acoustic frame and text tokens, respectively. All modules of a Transducer model are jointly trained to maximize the probability of the correct labels given the acoustic input, where the probability of the labels sums over all possible alignments of input/output, by including blanks to the label sequence.

## 2.2. Token-and-Duration Transducers

TDT improves upon conventional Transducers by incorporating the prediction of token duration in the joiner output. While conventional Transducers predict  $P(v|t, u)$ , TDT model predicts a joint distribution  $P(v, d|t, u)$ . The additional variable  $d$  represents the predicted duration at the location  $(t, u)$ . In [17], a simple conditional independence assumption was made, i.e.,

$$P(v, d|t, u) = P_T(v|t, u)P_D(d|t, u), \quad (1)$$

where  $P_T(\cdot)$  and  $P_D(\cdot)$  represent the token and duration output distribution, respectively.

TDT’s duration prediction  $d$  guides its decoding procedure to skip input frames during inference. Specifically, the max duration  $\mathcal{D}_{\max}$  is a hyper-parameter pre-defined before training. For example, if we set  $\mathcal{D}_{\max}$  to 4, the possible predicted durations would be  $\mathcal{D} = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$ . It is important to note that a larger preset value of  $\mathcal{D}_{\max}$  leads to more aggressive frame-skipping by the model.

Due to the introduction of duration modeling, TDT performs *frame asynchronous* search and consequently achieves significant speedup compared to the conventional *frame synchronous* Transducer-based systems, such as RNN-T. This motivates us to introduce TDT to KWS in this paper. However, we point out that the default search algorithms for conventional Transducers and TDT are designed for ASR tasks, which do not take into account the characteristics of KWS tasks and hence are neither effective nor efficient.

## Alg. 1: Streaming KWS-Decoding for Transducers

---

**Input:** keyword  $\mathbf{y} = \{\phi, y_1, \dots, y_U\}$   
**Output:**  $Score[T]$

```

1 Init:  $Score[1 : T] = \{0\}$ ,
    $\phi(0, u) = 0, \delta(0, u) = 1$  for  $0 \leq u \leq U, G = \{\phi\}$ ,
    $t = 1, d = 1$ .
2 while  $t \leq T$  do
3    $\delta(t, 0) = 1$ ;
4   for  $u \leftarrow 1$  to  $U$  do
5      $\delta(t, u) = \max(\delta(t, u - 1) \cdot y(t, u - 1), \delta(t -$ 
6        $d, u) \cdot \phi(t - d, u))$ 
7   end
8    $Score[t] = \delta(t, U) \cdot \phi(t, U)$ ;
9   if RNN-T KWS then
10     $d = 1$ ;
11  else if TDT KWS then
12     $d = \operatorname{argmax}_d P_D(d|t, G)$ ;
13     $v = \operatorname{argmax}_v P_T(v|t, G)$ ;
14     $G \leftarrow G \cup \{v\}$ ;
15    for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $d - 1$  do
16       $Score[t + i] = 0$ ;
17    end
18     $t = t + d$ ;
19 end
20 return  $Score[1 : T]$ 

```

---

To address this, we propose a KWS-specific decoding algorithm for Transducer models.

## 2.3. Efficient Streaming KWS-Decoding Algorithm

This section presents an effective KWS-specific steaming decoding algorithm, which works for both conventional Transducers and TDT, and could be extended to other extensions of Transducers as well. Unlike ASR decoding where the predictor is recursively fed *partial hypotheses* during decoding, we feed only the *decoded keyword token sequence* to the predictor, since the main objective of KWS is to detect the presence or absence of the keyword in the audio rather than generating a complete hypothesis. This approach is somewhat similar to the parallel computation of the RNN-T loss or the teacher-forcing strategy commonly used to train auto-regressive models. We denote acoustic features as  $\mathbf{x} = \{x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_T\}$  and keyword token sequence  $\mathbf{y} = \{y_0 = \phi, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_U\}$  ( $y_0$  denotes the blank symbol), and we represent the token/blank emission probabilities following standard Transducer literature as follows:

$$y(t, u) = P(y_{u+1} | \mathbf{x}_{[1:t]}, \mathbf{y}_{[0:u]}), \quad (2)$$

and

$$\phi(t, u) = P(\phi | \mathbf{x}_{[1:t]}, \mathbf{y}_{[0:u]}), \quad (3)$$

for  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $u \in [0, U]$ .

For conventional Transducer models, the decoding algorithm employs a decoding lattice as depicted in Figure 1. We define  $\delta(t, u)$  as the path with the highest score among all paths reaching the node  $(t, u)$ . In a streaming decoding scenario, where the keyword can start at any moment within the speech stream, we need to pay special attention to the starting time step of the keyword. To address this, we assign a score of 1 to  $\delta(t, 0)$  for each time step  $t$ , which allows for detecting the keyword starting from any moment and seamlessly facilitates wake word detection in continuous speech. By leveraging dynamic programming, as shown in Algorithm 1, we can efficiently

compute the complete path score  $\delta(t, U)$  of the keyword. Subsequently, the keyword confidence at time  $t$  can be obtained by multiplying the path score  $\delta(t, U)$  and the blank score  $\phi(t, U)$ :

$$\text{Score}[t] = \delta(t, U) \cdot \phi(t, U). \quad (4)$$

For TDT models, small modifications are required in the KWS decoding algorithm, as the predicted duration allows us to skip frames. The specific details are presented in Algorithm 1

### 3. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

#### 3.1. Datasets

We evaluate TDT-KWS on three scenarios: 1. fixed single keyword utterance, 2. keywords in continuous speech, and 3. keywords in noisy environments. We use the following datasets.

- **Hey Snips** [18]. The Hey Snips dataset is an open-source KWS dataset that specifically uses “Hey Snips” as the keyword, pronounced without pause between the two words. The dataset consists of 5876, 2504, and 2588 positive utterances, and 45344, 20321, and 20821 negative utterances in the train, dev, and test datasets. Due to the absence of complete transcripts for the negative utterances, we exclusively utilize the negative segments to evaluate false alarms rather than include them in the training process. To create the false alarm dataset, we combine all the negative utterances from the train, dev, and test datasets, resulting in a dataset with approximately 97 hours of audio.
- **LibriSpeech** [19]. LibriSpeech is a widely utilized speech corpus that comprises 960 hours of read English speech accompanied by corresponding transcripts. In order to simulate the scenario of detecting wake words within a continuous stream of speech, we choose 20 specific words from the LibriSpeech dataset to serve as keywords, forming a KWS version of LibriSpeech, known as **LibriKWS-20**. To construct the false alarm dataset, we combine the audio samples from the test dataset that do not contain the selected keywords. The duration of the false alarm datasets for both the test-clean and test-other test sets is about 3 hours. We present these selected keywords in Table 1.
- **WHAM!** [20]. The WHAM! dataset is an ambient noise corpus recorded in urban environments such as restaurants, bars, etc. It comprises various scenarios and provides a collection of background noises encountered in real-world settings. To evaluate the robustness of the model in noisy environments, we mix the test portion of the WHAM! dataset with the positive audio samples from the Hey Snips dataset at different SNRs.

#### 3.2. Experimental Setup

During training, we incorporate online speech perturbation [21], where the warping factors are randomly selected from the set 0.9, 1.0, 1.1. The acoustic features consist of 40-dimensional log Mel-filter bank coefficients (FBank) extracted using a 25ms window with a 10ms window hop. SpecAugment [22] is applied during training, employing a maximum frequency mask range of  $F = 10$  and a maximum time mask range of  $T = 50$ . Specifically, two masks of each type are used for each data sample. We splice five frames from the left and right contexts to construct 440-dimensional features and set the frame-skipping parameter to 3, resulting in three times subsampling. We follow Tiny Transducer [15] in the encoder architecture and the setup of hyper-parameters. Specifically, The encoder comprises 6 DFSMN layers, with hidden and

Keywords				
almost	anything	behind	captain	children
company	continued	country	everything	hardly
himself	husband	moment	morning	necessary
perhaps	silent	something	therefore	together

**Table 1.** The selected keywords in LibriKWS-20. The keywords for test-clean and test-other two datasets are the same.

projection sizes of 512 and 320, respectively. For all DFSMN layers, the left and right context frames are set to 8 and 2. We utilize the stateless predictor implemented in NeMo [23], configuring the context sizes as two and the embedding dimensions as 320. The joiner converts the 320-dimensional encoder and decoder outputs into 256-dim representations, which are activated and projected to final outputs. The final output units for the original Transducer include 70 monophones, derived from the CMU pronouncing dictionary “cmudict-0.7b” [24], and one blank symbol. For TDT, the output units also include the possible predicted duration options. Both RNN-T and TDT modes have approximately 2M parameters suitable for on-device KWS systems. The additional parameters in TDT for duration prediction can be negligible, as they only account for 0.1% of the total parameter count.

For LibriKWS-20, we train models using LibriSpeech-960h. For Snips, we initialize the training with the pre-trained model on LibriSpeech-960h. Then, we train the model using the positive data from Hey Snips, along with an equally sized set of utterances randomly selected from LibriSpeech-960h.

#### 3.3. Evaluation Metrics

To evaluate the performance of different models, we report the recall at a specific false alarm rate (FAR). For LibriKWS-20, which includes 20 keywords, it is typical to use *macro-recall* and averaged FAR across all keywords. We measure inference speed in two metrics: 1. the overall inference speed-up of the system and 2. the execution speed-up of the inference module. We denote them as *relative running speed-up* and *relative search speed-up*, respectively.

## 4. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

#### 4.1. Decoding Algorithm Comparison: ASR VS KWS-specific


We compare our proposed KWS-decoding algorithm with ASR decoding methods for KWS tasks in terms of *macro recall* and speed. As the results show in Table 2, our method significantly outperforms ASR decoding algorithms, both in greedy or beam-search modes.

Model	Decoding Alg.	Macro-recall		
		Snips	test-clean	test-other
RNN-T KWS	Greedy Search	79.7	82.5	57.6
	Beam Search (beam=10)	89.4	82.7	60.0
	Proposed	<b>98.7</b>	<b>97.5</b>	<b>88.1</b>
TDT-KWS	Greedy Search	85.4	84.6	63.2
	Proposed	<b>98.9</b>	<b>98.3</b>	<b>87.9</b>

**Table 2.** Comparisons of different decoding algorithms on three test datasets. For a fair comparison, we ensure the false alarms are similar across different systems. Beam-search implementation of TDT is not available at the time of writing.

Model	$\mathcal{D}_{\max}$	Macro-recall			Rel. S. Speed-up			Rel. R. Speed-up		
		Snips	test-clean	test-other	Snips	test-clean	test-other	Snips	test-clean	test-other
RNN-T KWS	-	98.1	99.0	90.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
TDT-KWS	2	98.2	97.9	89.3	1.44X	1.57X	1.57X	1.39X	1.53X	1.54X
	4	98.0	98.5	<b>91.9</b>	3.20X	2.03X	1.98X	2.88X	1.95X	1.90X
	6	97.7	<b>99.1</b>	90.3	3.63X	2.06X	2.03X	3.20X	1.97X	1.95X
	8	96.2	98.8	90.9	4.09X	2.06X	2.00X	3.52X	1.97X	1.92X
	10	<b>98.6</b>	98.7	89.5	<b>4.19X</b>	<b>2.15X</b>	<b>2.05X</b>	<b>3.58X</b>	<b>2.04X</b>	<b>1.97X</b>

**Table 3.** Performance comparison between RNN-T KWS and TDT-KWS under FAR = 0.02/h, (2/97h) on “Hey Snips” dataset and under averaged FAR = 0.67/h, (2/3h) on LibriKWS-20 dataset. Relative speed-up is measured against the RNN-T model.  $\mathcal{D}_{\max}$  is a hyper-parameter for TDT models representing the maximum duration that can be skipped.




**Fig. 2.** Heatmaps of the wake-up score at each (t,u). The utterance is picked from the test-clean dataset, and the keyword is *everything*. The vertical yellow dashed lines represent the boundary information derived from force-alignments. Please zoom in to view the details.

This improvement in performance can be attributed to the fact that our decoding algorithm restricts the search space to only the keyword, rather than all possible decoding sequences, which makes our algorithm achieve better results. As a result, we only use KWS-decoding algorithms for all subsequent experiments.

#### 4.2. Model Performance: TDT VS RNN-T

In Table 3, the performance of RNN-T KWS and TDT-KWS systems with different maximum duration skipping value,  $\mathcal{D}_{\max}$ , is presented. The results show that TDT-KWS can achieve comparable or better performance than RNN-T KWS. More importantly, all TDT-KWS models achieve significant speed-up compared to the RNN-T KWS system. This can also be shown by the examples in Figure 2, where TDT obviously has less search frequency. Moreover, the speed-up becomes even more pronounced as the value of  $\mathcal{D}_{\max}$  increases. The model still achieves superb results for Hey Snips when  $\mathcal{D}_{\max}$  is large. But for LibriKWS-20, the best performance is observed when  $\mathcal{D}_{\max}$  is set to 4 or 6, and it gradually degrades as  $\mathcal{D}_{\max}$  increases beyond these values. These findings highlight the trade-off between performance and computational efficiency when using TDT-KWS systems with different  $\mathcal{D}_{\max}$  values.

The observed results align with intuitive expectations. In the case of the Hey Snips dataset, each positive test utterance consists of silence segments and the single phrase “Hey Snips”, whose pattern is relatively straightforward for the model to learn. Consequently, even with a significant number of skipped frames, the model can confidently identify frames containing crucial phonetic information. Therefore, the model performs well regardless of a larger value for  $\mathcal{D}_{\max}$ . On the other hand, for the more challenging LibriKWS-20 dataset, when  $\mathcal{D}_{\max}$  is not very large, the model improves its performance by selectively disregarding interfering frames and focusing on frames that contain essential phonetic information, contributing to the enhancement of the model’s performance. However, as  $\mathcal{D}_{\max}$  increases significantly, the model may skip specific tokens that should have been predicted, leading to a performance degradation.



**Fig. 3.** Recall and inference speed comparison between RNN-T KWS and TDT-KWS at different SNR. SNR=+inf means no noise is added.

#### 4.3. Noise Robustness

In this section, the RNN-T KWS and TDT-KWS systems are evaluated for their robustness to noise by running decoding on the Hey Snips dataset augmented with WHAM! noise at different SNRs. The positive test samples are augmented with noise samples in 0, 5, 10, 15, and 20 SNRs, without retraining the models on the augmented data. The results, as shown in Figure 3, indicate that as the noise level increases, the performance gap between the RNN-T KWS and the TDT-KWS widens further. Moreover, the TDT-KWS system consistently exhibits speed improvements relative to the RNN-T KWS system across different SNRs. This indicates that the TDT model not only achieves better performance in noise but also maintains its efficiency by providing consistent speed enhancements. Overall, these findings emphasize the TDT-KWS system’s ability to effectively handle noise and exhibit rapid search speed, making it a promising choice for KWS in noisy environments.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we propose TDT-KWS, which applies Token-and-Duration Transducers (TDT) to KWS tasks. Our experiments show TDT-KWS not only outperforms the RNN-T KWS in terms of performance but also exhibits a significant improvement in inference speed. Additionally, TDT-KWS showcases enhanced robustness in noisy environments. We also propose an efficient KWS-specific decoding algorithm for Transducers in continuous streaming scenarios. It is more suitable for the KWS task, demonstrating superior performance to conventional ASR decoding methods. In the future, we will further explore the potential of TDT-KWS in more complex acoustic environments, and continue to optimize our decoding algorithm.

## 6. REFERENCES

- [1] Guoguo Chen, Carolina Parada, and Georg Heigold, “Small-footprint keyword spotting using deep neural networks,” in *Proc. IEEE ICASSP*. 2014, pp. 4087–4091, IEEE.
- [2] Matthew B Hoy, “Alexa, siri, cortana, and more: An introduction to voice assistants,” *Medical Reference Services Quarterly*, vol. 37, pp. 81 – 88, 2018.
- [3] Alex Graves, “Sequence transduction with recurrent neural networks,” in *ICML — Workshop on Representation Learning*, 2012.
- [4] Zhengkun Tian, Jiangyan Yi, Jianhua Tao, Ye Bai, and Zhengqi Wen, “Self-attention transducers for end-to-end speech recognition,” in *Proc. ISCA Interspeech*, Gernot Kubin and Zdravko Kacic, Eds., 2019, pp. 4395–4399.
- [5] Ching-Feng Yeh, Jay Mahadeokar, Kaustubh Kalgaonkar, Yongqiang Wang, Duc Le, Mahaveer Jain, Kjell Schubert, Christian Fuegen, and Michael L. Seltzer, “Transformer-transducer: End-to-end speech recognition with self-attention,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/1910.12977, 2019.
- [6] Qian Zhang, Han Lu, Hasim Sak, Anshuman Tripathi, Erik McDermott, Stephen Koo, and Shankar Kumar, “Transformer transducer: A streamable speech recognition model with transformer encoders and rnn-t loss,” in *Proc. IEEE ICASSP*, 2020, pp. 7829–7833.
- [7] Wei Han, Zhengdong Zhang, Yu Zhang, Jiahui Yu, Chung-Cheng Chiu, James Qin, Anmol Gulati, Ruoming Pang, and Yonghui Wu, “ContextNet: Improving Convolutional Neural Networks for Automatic Speech Recognition with Global Context,” in *Proc. ISCA Interspeech*, 2020, pp. 3610–3614.
- [8] Anmol Gulati, James Qin, Chung-Cheng Chiu, Niki Parmar, Yu Zhang, Jiahui Yu, Wei Han, Shibo Wang, Zhengdong Zhang, Yonghui Wu, and Ruoming Pang, “Conformer: Convolution-augmented Transformer for Speech Recognition,” in *Proc. ISCA Interspeech*, 2020, pp. 5036–5040.
- [9] Jian Xue, Peidong Wang, Jinyu Li, Matt Post, and Yashesh Gaur, “Large-scale streaming end-to-end speech translation with neural transducers,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05352*, 2022.
- [10] Yanzhang He, Rohit Prabhavalkar, Kanishka Rao, Wei Li, Anton Bakhtin, and Ian McGraw, “Streaming small-footprint keyword spotting using sequence-to-sequence models,” *Proc. IEEE ASRU*, pp. 474–481, 2017.
- [11] Eva Sharma, Guoli Ye, Wenning Wei, Rui Zhao, Yao Tian, Jian Wu, Lei He, Ed Lin, and Yifan Gong, “Adaptation of rnn transducer with text-to-speech technology for keyword spotting,” in *Proc. IEEE ICASSP*, 2020, pp. 7484–7488.
- [12] Yao Tian, Haitao Yao, Meng Cai, Yaming Liu, and Zejun Ma, “Improving rnn transducer modeling for small-footprint keyword spotting,” in *Proc. IEEE ICASSP*, 2021, pp. 5624–5628.
- [13] Zuozhen Liu, Ta Li, and Pengyuan Zhang, “Rnn-t based open-vocabulary keyword spotting in mandarin with multi-level detection,” *Proc. IEEE ICASSP*, pp. 5649–5653, 2021.
- [14] Zhanheng Yang, Sining Sun, Jin Li, Xiaoming Zhang, Xiong Wang, Long Ma, and Linfu Xie, “Catt-kws: A multi-stage customized keyword spotting framework based on cascaded transducer-transformer,” in *Proc. ISCA Interspeech*, 2022.
- [15] Yuekai Zhang, Sining Sun, and Long Ma, “Tiny transducer: A highly-efficient speech recognition model on edge devices,” *Proc. IEEE ICASSP*, pp. 6024–6028, 2021.
- [16] Shiliang Zhang, Ming Lei, Zhijie Yan, and Lirong Dai, “Deep-FSMN for large vocabulary continuous speech recognition,” in *Proc. IEEE ICASSP*, 2018, pp. 5869–5873.
- [17] Hainan Xu, Fei Jia, Somshubra Majumdar, He Huang, Shinji Watanabe, and Boris Ginsburg, “Efficient sequence transduction by jointly predicting tokens and durations,” in *Proc. ICML*, 2023, vol. 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 38462–38484.
- [18] Alice Coucke, Mohammed Chlieh, Thibault Gisselbrecht, David Leroy, Mathieu Poumeyrol, and Thibaut Lavril, “Efficient keyword spotting using dilated convolutions and gating,” *Proc. IEEE ICASSP*, pp. 6351–6355, 2018.
- [19] Vassil Panayotov, Guoguo Chen, Daniel Povey, and Sanjeev Khudanpur, “Librispeech: an asr corpus based on public domain audio books,” in *Proc. IEEE ICASSP*, 2015, pp. 5206–5210.
- [20] Gordon Wichern, Joe Antognini, Michael Flynn, Licheng Richard Zhu, Emmett McQuinn, Dwight Crow, Ethan Manilow, and Jonathan Le Roux, “Wham!: Extending speech separation to noisy environments,” in *Proc. ISCA Interspeech*, 2019.
- [21] Tom Ko, Vijayaditya Peddinti, Daniel Povey, and Sanjeev Khudanpur, “Audio augmentation for speech recognition,” in *Proc. ISCA Interspeech*, 2015.
- [22] Daniel S. Park, William Chan, Yu Zhang, Chung-Cheng Chiu, Barret Zoph, Ekin Dogus Cubuk, and Quoc V. Le, “SpecAugment: A simple data augmentation method for automatic speech recognition,” in *Proc. ISCA Interspeech*, 2019.
- [23] Oleksii Kuchaiev, Jason Li, Huyen Nguyen, Oleksii Hrinchuk, Ryan Leary, Boris Ginsburg, Samuel Krizan, Stanislav Beliaev, Vitaly Lavrukhin, Jack Cook, Patrice Castonguay, Mariya Popova, Jocelyn Huang, and Jonathan M. Cohen, “Nemo: a toolkit for building ai applications using neural modules,” in *NeurIPS Workshop on Systems for ML*, 2019.
- [24] “The CMU pronouncing dictionary,” <http://www.speech.cs.cmu.edu/cgi-bin/cmudict>.