# wav2graph: A Framework for Supervised Learning Knowledge Graph from Speech

Khai Le-Duc<sup>\*1,2,4</sup>, Quy-Anh Dang<sup>\*3,6</sup>, Tan-Hanh Pham<sup>5</sup>, Truong-Son Hy<sup>4,7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Toronto, Canada <sup>2</sup>University Health Network, Canada

<sup>3</sup>VNU University of Science, Vietnam <sup>4</sup>FPT Software AI Center, Vietnam

<sup>5</sup>Florida Institute of Technology, USA

<sup>6</sup>Knovel Engineering Lab, Singapore <sup>7</sup>University of Alabama at Birmingham, USA duckhai.le@mail.utoronto.ca, thy@uab.edu

### Abstract

Knowledge graphs (KGs) enhance the performance of large language models (LLMs) and search engines by providing structured, interconnected data that improves reasoning and context-awareness. However, KGs only focus on text data, thereby neglecting other modalities such as speech. In this work, we introduce *wav2graph*, the first framework for supervised learning knowledge graph from speech data. Our pipeline are straightforward: (1) constructing a KG based on transcribed spoken utterances and a named entity database, (2) converting KG into embedding vectors, and (3)training graph neural networks (GNNs) for node classification and link prediction tasks. Through extensive experiments conducted in inductive and transductive learning contexts using state-of-the-art GNN models, we provide baseline results and error analysis for node classification and link prediction tasks on human transcripts and automatic speech recognition (ASR) transcripts, including evaluations using both encoderbased and decoder-based node embeddings, as well as monolingual and multilingual acoustic pre-trained models. All related code, data, and models are published online.

## 1 Introduction

In the field of Artificial Intelligence (AI), KGs have emerged as a powerful approach to knowledge representation and reasoning. KGs leverage graph-structured models to encode entities (objects, events, concepts) and the relationships linking them (Fensel et al., 2020; Ji et al., 2021). This structured representation enables efficient storage, retrieval, and reasoning over vast amounts of interconnected information (Hogan et al., 2021; Chen et al., 2020).

The utility of KGs spans a variety of highimpact applications. For example, prominent search engines such as Bing, Google, and Yahoo employ KGs to enhance search relevance and personalization (Steiner et al., 2012; Uyar and Aliyu, 2015; Juel Vang, 2013). Knowledge engines and question-answering systems, such as Wolfram Alpha, Siri, and Alexa, leverage KGs to deliver precise and contextually appropriate responses (He et al., 2020; Fei et al., 2021). Social networks, including LinkedIn and Facebook, also utilize KGs to enrich user profiles and enable sophisticated social recommendations (Pellissier Tanon et al., 2016; Lehmann et al., 2015). Furthermore, over the past three years, KGs have become pivotal in enhancing the reasoning capabilities of LLMs by providing structured, interconnected data that enhances the model's ability to understand and generate contextually relevant and accurate information (Pan et al., 2024; Yasunaga et al., 2021; Ji et al., 2020).

Despite their significant advantages, the construction and training of voice-based KGs remains a complex and largely unexplored process. Among limited number of relevant works we found, to the best of our knowledge, Fu et al. (2021) claimed to present the first automatic KG construction system from speech. Wu et al. (2022) proposed a new information extraction task, speech relation extraction, that used extracted relations between synthetic ASR transcripts to build a KG. However, there has been no training conducted on such KGs to the best of our knowledge. Training KGs is necessary because GNN models can learn to extract and generalize complex patterns and relationships

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>(\*)</sup>Equal contribution



Figure 1: Visualization of our *wav2graph* framework. We train GNNs on the KG that is built from human transcript and its corresponding NEs. Then we infer directly on another KG that is built from ASR transcript to acquire node attributes and node relationships.

from the data in a KG, enabling the prediction on unseen data in the KG, which direct use of the KG alone (rule-based) cannot achieve.

To address this gap, this paper introduces *wav2graph*, a pioneering framework designed to train KGs directly from speech data. *wav2graph* leverages supervised learning GNNs to automate the process of extracting entities and relationships from spoken language, paving the way for the integration of speech-derived knowledge into various AI applications. Our contribution is summarized as follows:

- We propose, to the best of our knowledge, the first framework for supervised learning KGs from speech
- We release the first real-world KG from speech
- We present empirical baselines and conduct a comprehensive analysis of transductive and inductive learning on both human transcripts and ASR transcripts using state-of-the-art GNNs.

All code, data, and models are publicly available online<sup>1</sup>.

## 2 Data

### 2.1 Data Collection

We selected the *VietMed-NER* dataset (Le-Duc et al., 2024) as an initialization for our KG construction due to its status as the largest spoken

named entity recognition (NER) dataset in the world in terms of the number of entity types, characterized by 18 distinct entity types. The dataset focused on real-world medical conversations.

As shown in Figure 2, to construct the knowledge graph, we employ an entity-utteranceentity methodology (Al-Moslmi et al., 2020). NER is used to extract named entities (NEs) from text and categorize them into types such as person, location, and organization. Instead of utilizing an automatic NER system based on machine learning like most previous works (Thukral et al., 2023; Jia et al., 2018; Nie et al., 2021), we opted for goldstandard labels provided by human annotators to extract NEs. These NEs are then linked to the corresponding utterances that mention them, forming relational edges. Consequently, our knowledge graph comprises two types of nodes (entity type attribute): utterance and named entity. Named entities have an additional attribute, as they are classified into 18 distinct types, such as PERSON and LOCA-TION, etc,.

### 2.2 Data Statistics

Table 1: Data statistics of our knowledge graph

	Train	Dev	Test	Total
#Nodes	7228	2409	2409	12046
#Edges	12782	4260	4260	21302
#utterance nodes	5523	1884	1857	9264
$\#$ named_entity nodes	1705	525	552	2782

 $<sup>^{1}</sup> https://github.com/leduckhai/wav2graph$ 



Figure 2: An example of our KG. Node 101, 102, 103 is the utterance identification number, while remaining nodes are NEs. We follow entity-utteranceentity approach (Al-Moslmi et al., 2020) to present relationship between nodes in the KG.

Table 1 shows the data statistics for our knowledge graph.

### 3 wav2graph

Let  $x_1^T := x_1, x_2, ..., x_T$  be an audio signal of length T and let  $k \in K$  be an NE in the set of all NEs in database, the aim is to build a learning model f that conduct 2 single tasks:

- Node classification: Estimating the node attribute probability  $p(c|x_1^T \lor k)$  for each  $c \in C$ , where C is the number of attribute classes
- Link prediction: Estimating the edge probability  $p(e|x_1^T, k)$ , where  $e \in \{0, 1\}$  is the edge presence between 2 nodes,  $k \in K$  is an NE in the set of all NEs

Therefore, the decision rule to predict a single class for node classification task is:

$$x_1^T \lor k \to \hat{c} = \arg \max_{c \in C} f(c | x_1^T \lor k) \quad (1)$$

And the decision rule to predict a single class for link prediction task is:

$$x_1^T, k \to \hat{e} = \arg \max_{e \in \{0,1\}} f(e|x_1^T, k)$$
 (2)

### 3.1 ASR Model

An ASR model is used to transcribe audio signal into text by mapping an audio signal  $x_1^T$ of length T to the most likely word sequence  $w_1^N$  of length N. The relation  $w^*$  between the acoustic and word sequence is:

$$w^* = \arg\max_{w_1^N} p(w_1^N | x_1^T)$$
(3)

According to Bayes' Theorem, the probability  $p(x_1^T)$  can be ignored during maximization because it only serves as a normalization factor and does not affect the outcome:

$$p(w_1^N | x_1^T) = \frac{p(x_1^T | w_1^N) p(w_1^N)}{p(x_1^T)}$$

$$\propto p(x_1^T | w_1^N) p(w_1^N)$$
(4)

Therefore:

$$w^* = \arg\max_{w_1^N} \underbrace{p(x_1^T | w_1^N)}_{\text{acoustic model language model}} \cdot \underbrace{p(w_1^N)}_{\text{language model}}$$
(5)

### 3.2 Node Embeddings

Feature vectors for text in each node will be generated using selected pre-trained embedding models. Given a word sequence  $w_1^N$  and a NE k, node features generated by embedding functions are represented as an embedding vector:

$$z_1^d = Embedding(w_1^N) \tag{6}$$

## 3.3 Node Classification and Link Prediction

- Node classification is the task of predicting the labels of nodes in a graph G = (V, E)where V is the set of nodes and E is the set of edges. In a KG built from speech, V is the set of ASR transcript  $w_1^N$  and NE k. Given node features  $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{|V| \times d}$  and (one-hot) node labels  $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{|V| \times C}$  where d is the number of input features associating with each node, we aim to learn a function  $g: V \to \{1, \ldots, C\}$  that maps each node v with its corresponding label g(v).
- Link prediction is the task of predicting the existence of edges between node pairs in the graph. The goal is to predict a function  $h: V \times V \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  where h(u, v) = 1indicates the presence of an edge between two nodes u and v.

### 3.4 GNN Models

We explore the performance of various GNN models for node classification and link prediction. We use SAGE, GCN, GAT, and SuperGAT because they are well-suited for nonheterogeneous graphs, efficiently capturing local and global graph structure, and offering strong performance with scalable, interpretable architectures.

• SAGE (Sample and Aggregate) (Hamilton et al., 2017): Efficient GNN model that generates embeddings by sampling and aggregating features from a node's local neighborhood.

$$\boldsymbol{h}_{v}^{(l)} = \sigma(\boldsymbol{W}_{l} \cdot \operatorname{AGG}_{l}(\{\boldsymbol{h}_{u}^{(l-1)} : u \in \mathcal{N}(v)\} \cup \{\boldsymbol{h}_{v}^{(l-1)}\})),$$
(7)

where  $\mathbf{h}_{v}^{(l)}$  is node v's hidden state at layer  $l, \sigma$  is a non-linear activation,  $\mathbf{W}_{l}$  is a learnable weight matrix, AGG<sub>l</sub> is an aggregation function, and  $\mathcal{N}(v)$  is v's neighborhood.

• GCN (Graph Convolutional Network) (Kipf and Welling, 2017): Spectral-based GNN learning node representations based on local graph structure.

$$\boldsymbol{H}^{(l+1)} = \sigma(\tilde{\boldsymbol{D}}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}\tilde{\boldsymbol{D}}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{H}^{(l)}\boldsymbol{W}^{(l)}) \quad (8)$$

where  $\mathbf{H}^{(l)}$  is the *l*-th layer activation matrix,  $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{I}_N$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}$  is  $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ 's degree matrix, and  $\mathbf{W}^{(k)}$  is a trainable weight matrix,  $\mathbf{I}_N$  is is the identity matrix.

• GAT (Graph Attention Network) (Velickovic et al., 2018): Assigns attention weights to neighboring nodes, focusing on the most informative ones.

$$\mathbf{h}'_{u} = \sigma \bigg( \sum_{v \in \mathcal{N}(u) \cup \{u\}} \alpha_{uv} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{h}_{v} \bigg), \quad (9)$$

with attention coefficient defined as:

$$\alpha_{uv} = \frac{\exp(e_{uv})}{\sum_{t \in \mathcal{N}(u) \cup \{u\}} \exp(e_{ut})}, \qquad (10)$$

$$e_{uv} = \text{LeakyReLU}(\mathbf{a}^T[\mathbf{W}\mathbf{h}_u \| \mathbf{W}\mathbf{h}_v]),$$
(11)

where  $\mathbf{a}$  is a learnable attention vector.

• SuperGAT (Kim and Oh, 2021): Extends GAT to incorporate node and edge features in the attention mechanism.

$$\mathbf{h}'_{u} = \sigma(\sum_{v \in \mathcal{N}(u) \cup \{u\}} \alpha_{uv} \mathbf{W}[\mathbf{h}_{v} \| \mathbf{e}_{uv}]), \ (12)$$

where  $\mathbf{e}_{uv}$  is the edge feature vector. SuperGAT uses an auxiliary loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{att} = \sum_{u,v} \|\alpha_{uv} - \alpha_{uv}^*\|^2, \qquad (13)$$

with  $\alpha_{uv}^*$  denotes the ground truth attention weight.

### 4 Experimental Setups

### 4.1 ASR Models

We employed hybrid ASR approach to transcribe audio to text. First, we generated Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM) labels as input for Deep Neural Network / Hidden Markov Model (DNN/HMM) training. We employed wav2vec 2.0 encoder (Baevski et al., 2020b) for the DNN, which was unsupervised pre-trained on either monolingual data or multilingual data. Their WERs on the test set were 29.0% and 28.8%, respectively. More details are shown in Section B.1 in the Appendix.

### 4.2 KG and GNN Models

GNN model training: Our research includes three training settings. Initially, the data is divided into training (60%), validation (20%), and testing (20%) sets. Each GNN model is trained on the training set, with hyperparameter tuning on the validation set using metrics such as AP and AUC, then validate on test sets (known as inductive graph learning). In the second setting, models are trained on one dataset and inferenced on an unseen dataset, meaning the two KGs are independent in this scenario (known as transductive graph learning). Lastly, models are trained on the complete dataset from the first setting and directly inferenced on two KGs extracted from ASR (transductive learning) with WER 28.8% - monolingual acoustic pre-training, and 29.0% - multilingual acoustic pre-training. More details are shown in Section B.2 in the Appendix.

**Embeddings**: Our study investigates the influence of pre-trained embeddings on node classification and link prediction tasks within a KG. We used both encoder-based embeddings (such as the English Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5 (Li et al., 2023b), the multilingual intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct (Wang et al., 2024), and Vietnamese vinai/phobert-base-v2 (Nguyen and Nguyen, 2020)) and decoder-based embedding (like the multilingual LLM Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen2-7B-instruct (qwe, 2024)), as well as random embeddings (Paszke et al., 2019). Feature vectors for text in each node will be generated

using selected pre-trained embedding models. More details are shown in Section B.3 in the Appendix.

### 4.3 Evaluation Metrics

In our study, we employ two evaluation metrics: Average Precision Score (AP) and Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic Curve (ROC AUC or AUC) to assess the performance of our GNN models on both node classification and link prediction tasks. Details are shown in Section B.4 in the Appendix.

### 5 Experimental Results

### 5.1 Node Classification on Human Transcript

### 5.1.1 Inductive Learning

Table 2: Evaluation Results for Node Classification Task using Inductive Graph Learning on Human Transcript

Model	Embedding	AP Score	AUC Score
SAGE	random	0.9116	0.8373
SAGE	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	1	1
SAGE	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	1	1
SAGE	vinai/phobert-base-v2	1	1
SAGE	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen 2-7B-instruct	0.8017	0.8714
GCN	random	0.7824	0.5333
GCN	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.7704	0.5
GCN	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.7684	0.5
GCN	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.758	0.5
GCN	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen 2-7B-instruct	0.2344	0.513
GAT	random	0.802	0.5849
GAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.9981	0.9963
GAT	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.7684	0.5
GAT	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.9968	0.9944
GAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen 2-7B-instruct	0.2932	0.6052
SuperGAT	random	0.803	0.5876
SuperGAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.9969	0.9941
SuperGAT	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.7684	0.5
SuperGAT	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.9968	0.9941
SuperGAT	${\it Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen 2-7B-instruct}$	0.2838	0.5887

The experimental results in Table 2 show that using pre-trained embeddings significantly enhances node classification performance across all models, with perfect AP and AUC scores of 1, compared to lower scores (AP: 0.9116, AUC: 0.8373 for SAGE with random embeddings and AP: 0.8017, AUC: 0.714 for Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen2-7B-instruct).

Utterance nodes generally have a degree greater than 1, while named\_entity nodes have a degree of 1; the SAGE architecture uses node degrees and local neighborhood features, leading to perfect model accuracy.

The significant contribution of pre-trained embeddings and architecture to model performance is evident, with GAT and SuperGAT models achieving high AP and AUC scores using Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5 embeddings, while the GCN model shows limited variation in performance with different embeddings, indicating its potential limitations of leveraging these embeddings.

The Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen2-7B-instruct embedding exhibits poor performance across most models, indicating that high-dimensional LLM embeddings can suffer from the curse of dimensionality, and the learned information may be insufficient when there are not enough data points to establish a general pattern as recently argued in some other natural language processing (NLP) tasks (Petukhova et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2023).

### 5.1.2 Transductive Learning

The evaluation results for the node classification task in Table 3 demonstrate varied performance across different models and embeddings. Among the models, SAGE combined with random embedding shows relatively high AP and AUC scores (AP: 0.792, AUC: 0.8564), indicating robust performance.

Table 3: Evaluation Results for Node ClassificationTask using Transductive Graph Learning on HumanTranscript

Model	Embedding	AP Score	AUC Score
SAGE	random	0.792	0.8564
SAGE	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.5326	0.5596
SAGE	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.7009	0.7929
SAGE	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.7426	0.8222
SAGE	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen2-7B-instruct	0.7488	0.8541
GCN	random	0.2983	0.5343
GCN	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.3004	0.5295
GCN	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.3042	0.532
GCN	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.2817	0.5072
GCN	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen2-7B-instruct	0.2936	0.5214
GAT	random	0.3682	0.6167
GAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.5514	0.5897
GAT	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.3648	0.6145
GAT	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.3557	0.5999
GAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen2-7B-instruct	0.3113	0.5468
SuperGAT	random	0.3657	0.6088
SuperGAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.5488	0.5896
SuperGAT	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.3502	0.5895
SuperGAT	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.353	0.5965
SuperGAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen2-7B-instruct	0.2786	0.5019

## 5.2 Link Prediction on Human Transcript

### 5.2.1 Inductive Learning

Table 4 shows that pre-trained embeddings greatly improve model performance in link prediction, with SAGE's AP score rising from 0.4649 to 0.7613 and its AUC score from 0.4912 to 0.7869 using vinai/phobert-base-v2 embeddings. Similarly, the GAT model's perfor-

Table 4: Evaluation Results for Link Prediction Task using Inductive Graph Learning on Human Transcript

Model	Embedding	AP Score	AUC Score
SAGE	random	0.4649	0.4912
SAGE	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.5321	0.5425
SAGE	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.555	0.593
SAGE	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.7613	0.7869
SAGE	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen 2-7B-instruct	0.4771	0.5219
GCN	random	0.5263	0.5193
GCN	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.5504	0.3526
GCN	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.5	0.5
GCN	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.6432	0.5284
GCN	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen 2-7B-instruct	0.4934	0.5
GAT	random	0.47	0.4617
GAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.7312	0.7242
GAT	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.5	0.5
GAT	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.7801	0.8144
GAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen 2-7B-instruct	0.5055	0.5102
SuperGAT	random	0.5013	0.5019
SuperGAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.6863	0.681
SuperGAT	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.5	0.5
SuperGAT	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.7522	0.7785
SuperGAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen 2-7B-instruct	0.5037	0.5401

mance improves significantly with these embeddings, achieving an AP score of 0.7801 and an AUC score of 0.8144, compared to 0.47 and 0.4617 with random embeddings; however, the GCN model shows less consistent improvements. These results underscore the critical importance of embedding quality in link prediction tasks.

### 5.2.2 Transductive Learning

The link prediction task results in Table 5 reveal differences in model effectiveness. The GCN model demonstrates superior performance, particularly when paired with random embeddings (AP: 0.9132, AUC: 0.9243) and the intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct embedding (AP: 0.9015, AUC: 0.9183). In contrast, SAGE and GAT models generally exhibit lower performance, with AP and AUC scores hovering around 0.54 and 0.56, respectively. Notably, SuperGAT with intfloat/multilingual-e5-largeinstruct achieves higher scores (AP: 0.6323, AUC: 0.6673), indicating a moderate level of effectiveness.

## 5.3 Node Classification on ASR Transcript

# 5.3.1 Monolingual Acoustic Pre-training (WER=29.0%)

ASR-extracted utterances often lead to reduced accuracy due to noisy transcripts compared to human transcripts. The evaluation results in Table 6 for the node classification task exhibit a consistent trend with the previous findings,

Table 5: Evaluation Results for Link Prediction Task using Transductive Graph Learning on Human Transcript

Model	Embedding	AP Score	AUC Score
SAGE	random	0.541	0.5615
SAGE	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.5335	0.5429
SAGE	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.5338	0.5497
SAGE	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.5123	0.5213
SAGE	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen2-7B-instruct	0.5238	0.5402
GCN	random	0.9132	0.9243
GCN	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.5968	0.6606
GCN	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.9015	0.9183
GCN	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.8568	0.8515
GCN	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen2-7B-instruct	0.8742	0.8855
GAT	random	0.5311	0.5576
GAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.5419	0.5763
GAT	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.5331	0.5611
GAT	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.5336	0.561
GAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen2-7B-instruct	0.5457	0.5818
SuperGAT	random	0.5279	0.5552
SuperGAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.5307	0.5583
SuperGAT	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.6323	0.6673
SuperGAT	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.5086	0.5169
SuperGAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen2-7B-instruct	0.556	0.5997

Table 6: Evaluation Results for Node Classification Task on ASR Transcript using Monolingual Acoustic Pre-training

Model	Embedding	AP Score	AUC Score
SAGE	random	0.8851	0.9204
SAGE	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.8108	0.8694
SAGE	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.8591	0.9028
SAGE	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.7969	0.8597
SAGE	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen2-7B-instruct	0.8661	0.9077
GCN	random	0.2974	0.5202
GCN	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.2976	0.521
GCN	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.2813	0.5052
GCN	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.3037	0.5211
GCN	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen2-7B-instruct	0.326	0.5417
GAT	random	0.2813	0.5808
GAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.3049	0.5406
GAT	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.3342	0.5758
GAT	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.3334	0.5697
GAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen2-7B-instruct	0.3521	0.5965
SuperGAT	random	0.2778	0.4998
SuperGAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.3526	0.5909
SuperGAT	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.2861	0.5145
SuperGAT	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.2751	0.4859
SuperGAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen2-7B-instruct	0.328	0.5682

but with some differences. SAGE consistently outperforms others across all embedding types, achieving the highest AP score of 0.8851 and AUC score of 0.9204 with random embeddings, surpassing even the more sophisticated embedding methods, while GCN, GAT, and Super-GAT models lag behind significantly.

# 5.3.2 Multilingual Acoustic Pre-training (WER=28.8%)

Results in Table 7 show patterns in model performance for the node classification task on ASR transcript using multilingual acoustic pretraining. SAGE outperforms GCN, GAT, and SuperGAT across all embedding types. Notably, SAGE combined with the vinai/phobertbase-v2 embedding achieves peak performance, with AUC score of 0.9266. SAGE is fur-

Table 7: Evaluation Results for Node Classification Task with on ASR Transcript using Multilingual Acoustic Pre-training

Model	Embedding	AP Score	AUC Score
SAGE	random	0.8554	0.9002
SAGE	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.8307	0.8831
SAGE	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.8634	0.9058
SAGE	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.8935	0.9266
SAGE	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen2-7B-instruct	0.9258	0.8959
GCN	random	0.3015	0.5233
GCN	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.2811	0.5057
GCN	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.3215	0.532
GCN	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.3242	0.5428
GCN	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen 2-7B-instruct	0.7354	0.5325
GAT	random	0.3315	0.5703
GAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.3052	0.5376
GAT	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.3609	0.6012
GAT	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.3661	0.6088
GAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen2-7B-instruct	0.7674	0.6056
SuperGAT	random	0.3519	0.5819
SuperGAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.2862	0.5149
SuperGAT	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.2805	0.5056
SuperGAT	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.3268	0.5647
SuperGAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen2-7B-instruct	0.7669	0.6046

ther well-performed even with random embeddings. Comparatively, multilingual acoustic pre-training shows slight improvements across most models compared to monolingual pretraining, although WERs are relatively comparable. However, the Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen2-7B-instruct embedding significantly outperforms other embeddings and GNN models using multilingual acoustic pre-training. Therefore, multilingual LLM text embeddings achieve optimal performance on node classification task when applied on multilingual acoustic pretraining ASR transcript.

# 5.4 Link Prediction on ASR Transcript

# 5.4.1 Monolingual Acoustic Pre-training (WER=29.0%)

Table 8: Evaluation Results for Link Prediction Task on ASR Transcript using Monolingual Acoustic Pre-training

Model	Embedding	AP Score	AUC Score
SAGE	random	0.5464	0.5701
SAGE	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.5326	0.5596
SAGE	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.5373	0.5617
SAGE	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.5415	0.5672
SAGE	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen 2-7B-instruct	0.544	0.5478
GCN	random	0.8991	0.9259
GCN	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.9085	0.9262
GCN	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.9159	0.9324
GCN	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.8811	0.8898
GCN	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen 2-7B-instruct	0.904	0.9232
GAT	random	0.5465	0.5825
GAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.5514	0.5897
GAT	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.5364	0.566
GAT	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.5496	0.5867
GAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen 2-7B-instruct	0.5486	0.5856
SuperGAT	random	0.5601	0.6117
SuperGAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.5488	0.5896
SuperGAT	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.5345	0.5718
SuperGAT	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.551	0.5492
SuperGAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen 2-7B-instruct	0.5369	0.5677

The evaluation results for the link prediction task on ASR transcript using monolingual pretraining, as presented in Table 8, indicate the performance of different models and embeddings. Among the models, GCN consistently outperforms SAGE, GAT, and SuperGAT in both AP and AUC scores, achieving the highest scores with the intfloat/multilingual-e5-largeinstruct embedding (AP: 0.9159, AUC: 0.9324). This suggests that GCN is more effective for link prediction tasks in this context, particularly when combined with the multilingual-e5large-instruct embedding.

## 5.4.2 Multilingual Acoustic Pre-training (WER=28.8%)

Table 9: Evaluation Results for Link Prediction Task on ASR Transcript using Multilingual Acoustic Pre-training

Model	Embedding	AP Score	AUC Score
SAGE	random	0.551	0.5828
SAGE	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.5246	0.5532
SAGE	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.5468	0.5759
SAGE	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.5245	0.5511
SAGE	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen 2-7B-instruct	0.5281	0.5492
GCN	random	0.8965	0.91
GCN	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.9184	0.9413
GCN	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.9	0.9229
GCN	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.9054	0.9301
GCN	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen 2-7B-instruct	0.869	0.8791
GAT	random	0.547	0.5823
GAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.5439	0.5954
GAT	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.5603	0.6104
GAT	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.5569	0.598
GAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen 2-7B-instruct	0.5228	0.5429
SuperGAT	random	0.5489	0.5867
SuperGAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5	0.53	0.5551
SuperGAT	intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct	0.5456	0.5805
SuperGAT	vinai/phobert-base-v2	0.5336	0.5579
SuperGAT	Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen 2-7B-instruct	0.5643	0.6137

Our empirical analysis of the link prediction task on ASR transcript using multilingual acoustic pre-training in Table 9 also reveals a distinct performance hierarchy among GNN architectures. The GCN emerges as the preeminent model, consistently outperforming its counterparts across all embedding configurations. Notably, the GCN variant utilizing the Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5 embedding achieves state-of-the-art performance, with an AP score of 0.9184 and AUC score of 0.9413. This stands in stark contrast to the SAGE architecture, which, despite its prowess in node classification, exhibits suboptimal performance in this link prediction task. The GAT and SuperGAT models demonstrate intermediate efficacy, marginally surpassing SAGE but falling significantly short of GCN's benchmark. The

intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct embedding consistently augments model performance, but with varying magnitudes of impact across architectures.

## 5.5 Error Analysis

Node classification and link prediction on human transcript: In inductive learning, BERT-based embeddings are essential for achieving optimal performance, whereas in transductive learning, random text embeddings demonstrate competitiveness with pre-trained embeddings.

Node classification on ASR transcript: Firstly, in the context of noisy ASR transcripts, both monolingual and multilingual acoustic pre-training settings demonstrate that random text embeddings perform competitively with BERT-based text embeddings. For comparison, this transductive learning approach for ASR transcripts is similar to the transductive learning used for node classification on human transcripts. Secondly, multilingual LLM text embeddings notably outperform others in node classification tasks when applied to multilingual acoustic pre-training ASR transcripts. As our study is the first evaluation of training KGs from speech, there is no existing literature for direct comparison. However, combination of multilingual LLM text embeddings and multilingual acoustic pre-training generally yield higher accuracy across various downstream tasks, e.g. ASR (Lam-Yee-Mui et al., 2023; Radford et al., 2023), speech translation (Bapna et al., 2022; Babu et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2023), text-to-speech (Saeki et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2019). Thirdly, within the same transductive learning setting, node classification on ASR transcripts generally achieved competitive results compared to human transcripts, despite relatively high WERs of 28.8%and 29%.

Link prediction on ASR transcript: Firstly, in the context of noisy ASR transcripts, both in monolingual and multilingual acoustic pre-training ASR settings, random text embeddings demonstrate performance comparable to BERT-based or LLM text embeddings. This transductive learning performance is also observed in the transductive learning of link prediction on human transcripts. Secondly, in the same transductive learning setting, link prediction on ASR transcripts generally outperformed that on human transcripts, despite relatively high WERs of 28.8% and 29%. This result is noteworthy, as high WERs in ASR transcripts typically degrade accuracy in various downstream NLP tasks, as widely demonstrated by the AI community (Desot et al., 2019; Sundararaman et al., 2021; Omachi et al., 2021). We hypothesized that the influence of text embedding, which primarily focuses on the generalized context of text segments (semantics), reduces the impact of ASR errors on prediction performance (Voleti et al., 2019). Thirdly, our transductive learning on ASR transcripts for both node classification and link prediction tasks was conducted in a zero-shot setting. We hypothesize that the adaptation of trained GNN models to the ASR transcripts of the training set could further enhance performance (Dinh, 2021; Ma et al., 2023).

# 6 Conclusion

In this study, we introduce *wav2graph*, the first framework for supervised learning of KG from speech data. Additionally, we present the first real-world KG derived from speech, along with its baseline results.

Our study demonstrates that, first of all, for node classification and link prediction tasks on ASR transcripts, both monolingual and multilingual acoustic pre-training with random text embeddings perform competitively with encoder-based and decoder-based embeddings. This trend is also observed in transductive learning on human transcripts. Secondly, multilingual LLM text embeddings significantly outperform other embeddings in node classification tasks when applied to multilingual acoustic pre-trained ASR transcripts. Thirdly, node classification on ASR transcripts generally achieves competitive results compared to human transcripts, while link prediction on ASR transcripts generally outperforms that on human transcripts, despite relatively high WERs of 28.8% and 29%. This unexpected behavior is likely due to the influence of text embeddings, which primarily focus on the generalized semantic context of text segments and therefore reduce the impact of ASR errors on prediction performance. This contrasts with most previous works on other downstream tasks, where

high WERs in ASR transcripts typically degrade accuracy.

### 7 Acknowledgement

We extend our gratitude to Oanh Tran at VNU-HCM University of Technology for her assistance in preparing the paper draft.

## References

2024. Qwen2 technical report.

- Tareq Al-Moslmi, Marc Gallofré Ocaña, Andreas L Opdahl, and Csaba Veres. 2020. Named entity extraction for knowledge graphs: A literature overview. *IEEE Access*, 8:32862–32881.
- Houda Alberts, Ningyuan Huang, Yash Deshpande, Yibo Liu, Kyunghyun Cho, Clara Vania, and Iacer Calixto. 2021. Visualsem: a high-quality knowledge graph for vision and language. In Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Multilingual Representation Learning, pages 138–152.
- Arun Babu, Changhan Wang, Andros Tjandra, Kushal Lakhotia, Qiantong Xu, Naman Goyal, Kritika Singh, Patrick von Platen, Yatharth Saraf, Juan Pino, et al. 2022. Xls-r: Selfsupervised cross-lingual speech representation learning at scale. *Interspeech*.
- Alexei Baevski, Henry Zhou, Abdelrahman Mohamed, and Michael Auli. 2020a. Wav2vec 2.0: A framework for self-supervised learning of speech representations. In Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS'20.
- Alexei Baevski, Yuhao Zhou, Abdelrahman Mohamed, and Michael Auli. 2020b. wav2vec 2.0: A framework for self-supervised learning of speech representations. *Advances in neural information* processing systems, 33:12449–12460.
- Ankur Bapna, Colin Cherry, Yu Zhang, Ye Jia, Melvin Johnson, Yong Cheng, Simran Khanuja, Jason Riesa, and Alexis Conneau. 2022. mslam: Massively multilingual joint pretraining for speech and text. arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.01374.
- Maximilian Bisani and Hermann Ney. 2008. Jointsequence models for grapheme-to-phoneme conversion. *Speech communication*, 50(5):434–451.
- Leo Breiman. 2017. Classification and regression trees. Routledge.
- Chen Cai, Truong Son Hy, Rose Yu, and Yusu Wang. 2023. On the connection between MPNN and graph transformer. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3408–3430. PMLR.

- Antoine Caubrière, Sophie Rosset, Yannick Estève, Antoine Laurent, and Emmanuel Morin. 2020. Where are we in named entity recognition from speech? In Proceedings of the Twelfth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference, pages 4514–4520.
- Boli Chen, Guangwei Xu, Xiaobin Wang, Pengjun Xie, Meishan Zhang, and Fei Huang. 2022. Aishell-ner: Named entity recognition from chinese speech. In *ICASSP 2022-2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 8352–8356. IEEE.
- Qi Chen, Wei Wang, Kaizhu Huang, and Frans Coenen. 2021. Zero-shot text classification via knowledge graph embedding for social media data. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 9(12):9205–9213.
- Xiaojun Chen, Shengbin Jia, and Yang Xiang. 2020. A review: Knowledge reasoning over knowledge graph. *Expert systems with applications*, 141:112948.
- Alexis Conneau, Alexei Baevski, Ronan Collobert, Abdelrahman Mohamed, and Michael Auli. 2021. Unsupervised Cross-Lingual Representation Learning for Speech Recognition. In Proc. Interspeech 2021, pages 2426–2430.
- Thierry Desot, François Portet, and Michel Vacher. 2019. Slu for voice command in smart home: comparison of pipeline and end-to-end approaches. In 2019 IEEE Automatic Speech Recognition and Understanding Workshop (ASRU), pages 822–829. IEEE.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers), pages 4171–4186.
- Pranay Dighe, Saurabh Adya, Nuoyu Li, Srikanth Vishnubhotla, Devang Naik, Adithya Sagar, Ying Ma, Stephen Pulman, and Jason Williams. 2020. Lattice-based improvements for voice triggering using graph neural networks. In *ICASSP 2020-2020 IEEE International Conference on Acous*tics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), pages 7459–7463. IEEE.
- Tu Anh Dinh. 2021. Zero-shot speech translation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.06010.
- Vijay Prakash Dwivedi, Ladislav Rampášek, Mikhail Galkin, Ali Parviz, Guy Wolf, Anh Tuan Luu, and Dominique Beaini. 2022. Long range graph benchmark. In *Thirty-sixth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets* and Benchmarks Track.

- Ellen Eide and Herbert Gish. 1996. A parametric approach to vocal tract length normalization. In 1996 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing Conference Proceedings, volume 1, pages 346–348. IEEE.
- Hao Fei, Yafeng Ren, Yue Zhang, Donghong Ji, and Xiaohui Liang. 2021. Enriching contextualized language model from knowledge graph for biomedical information extraction. *Briefings in bioinformatics*, 22(3):bbaa110.
- Dieter Fensel, Umutcan Şimşek, Kevin Angele, Elwin Huaman, Elias Kärle, Oleksandra Panasiuk, Ioan Toma, Jürgen Umbrich, Alexander Wahler, Dieter Fensel, et al. 2020. Introduction: what is a knowledge graph? *Knowledge graphs: Method*ology, tools and selected use cases, pages 1–10.
- G.D. Forney. 1973. The viterbi algorithm. Proceedings of the IEEE, 61(3):268–278.
- Xiaoyi Fu, Jie Zhang, Hao Yu, Jiachen Li, Dong Chen, Jie Yuan, and Xindong Wu. 2021. A speech-to-knowledge-graph construction system. In Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth International Conference on International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence, pages 5303–5305.
- Kunihiko Fukushima. 1979. Neural network model for a mechanism of pattern recognition unaffected by shift in position-neocognitron. *IEICE Technical Report*, A, 62(10):658–665.
- Kunihiko Fukushima. 1980. Neocognitron: A selforganizing neural network model for a mechanism of pattern recognition unaffected by shift in position. *Biological cybernetics*, 36(4):193–202.
- Justin Gilmer, Samuel S. Schoenholz, Patrick F. Riley, Oriol Vinyals, and George E. Dahl. 2017. Neural message passing for quantum chemistry. In Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 70, ICML'17, page 1263–1272. JMLR.org.
- Will Hamilton, Zhitao Ying, and Jure Leskovec. 2017. Inductive representation learning on large graphs. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Bin He, Di Zhou, Jinghui Xiao, Xin Jiang, Qun Liu, Nicholas Jing Yuan, and Tong Xu. 2020. Bertmk: Integrating graph contextualized knowledge into pre-trained language models. In *Findings of* the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020, pages 2281–2290.
- Liang He, Ruida Li, and Mengqi Niu. 2024. A study on graph embedding for speaker recognition. In ICASSP 2024-2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), pages 10741–10745. IEEE.

- Aidan Hogan, Eva Blomqvist, Michael Cochez, Claudia d'Amato, Gerard De Melo, Claudio Gutierrez, Sabrina Kirrane, José Emilio Labra Gayo, Roberto Navigli, Sebastian Neumaier, et al. 2021. Knowledge graphs. ACM Computing Surveys (Csur), 54(4):1–37.
- Haozhe Ji, Pei Ke, Shaohan Huang, Furu Wei, Xiaoyan Zhu, and Minlie Huang. 2020. Language generation with multi-hop reasoning on commonsense knowledge graph. In Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP), pages 725– 736.
- Shaoxiong Ji, Shirui Pan, Erik Cambria, Pekka Marttinen, and S Yu Philip. 2021. A survey on knowledge graphs: Representation, acquisition, and applications. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 33(2):494–514.
- Yan Jia, Yulu Qi, Huaijun Shang, Rong Jiang, and Aiping Li. 2018. A practical approach to constructing a knowledge graph for cybersecurity. *Engineering*, 4(1):53–60.
- Abhinav Joshi, Ashwani Bhat, Ayush Jain, Atin Singh, and Ashutosh Modi. 2022. Cogmen: Contextualized gnn based multimodal emotion recognition. In Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, pages 4148–4164.
- Katrine Juel Vang. 2013. Ethics of google's knowledge graph: some considerations. Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society, 11(4):245–260.
- Jee-weon Jung, Hee-Soo Heo, Hemlata Tak, Hye-jin Shim, Joon Son Chung, Bong-Jin Lee, Ha-Jin Yu, and Nicholas Evans. 2022. Aasist: Audio antispoofing using integrated spectro-temporal graph attention networks. In *ICASSP 2022-2022 IEEE international conference on acoustics, speech and signal processing (ICASSP)*, pages 6367–6371. IEEE.
- Jee-weon Jung, Hee-Soo Heo, Ha-Jin Yu, and Joon Son Chung. 2021. Graph attention networks for speaker verification. In ICASSP 2021-2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), pages 6149–6153. IEEE.
- Dongkwan Kim and Alice Oh. 2021. How to find your friendly neighborhood: Graph attention design with self-supervision. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Jinwoo Kim, Tien Dat Nguyen, Seonwoo Min, Sungjun Cho, Moontae Lee, Honglak Lee, and Seunghoon Hong. 2024. Pure transformers are powerful graph learners. In Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS '22, Red Hook, NY, USA. Curran Associates Inc.

- Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2014. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980.
- Thomas N Kipf and Max Welling. 2016. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.02907*.
- Thomas N. Kipf and Max Welling. 2017. Semisupervised classification with graph convolutional networks. In *International Conference* on Learning Representations.
- Léa-Marie Lam-Yee-Mui, Waad Ben Kheder, Viet-Bac Le, Claude Barras, and Jean-Luc Gauvain. 2023. Multilingual models with language embeddings for low-resource speech recognition. In 2nd Annual Meeting of the ELRA/ISCA SIG on Under-resourced Languages (SIGUL 2023), pages 83–87. ISCA.
- Khai Le-Duc. 2023. Unsupervised pre-training for vietnamese automatic speech recognition in the hykist project. arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.15869. Bachelor thesis at FH Aachen University of Applied Sciences.
- Khai Le-Duc. 2024. Vietmed: A dataset and benchmark for automatic speech recognition of vietnamese in the medical domain. In *Proceedings* of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024), pages 17365–17370.
- Khai Le-Duc, David Thulke, Hung-Phong Tran, Long Vo-Dang, Khai-Nguyen Nguyen, Truong-Son Hy, and Ralf Schlüter. 2024. Medical spoken named entity recognition.
- Jens Lehmann, Robert Isele, Max Jakob, Anja Jentzsch, Dimitris Kontokostas, Pablo N Mendes, Sebastian Hellmann, Mohamed Morsey, Patrick Van Kleef, Sören Auer, et al. 2015. Dbpedia– a large-scale, multilingual knowledge base extracted from wikipedia. *Semantic web*, 6(2):167– 195.
- Jing Li, Aixin Sun, Jianglei Han, and Chenliang Li. 2020. A survey on deep learning for named entity recognition. *IEEE transactions on knowledge* and data engineering, 34(1):50–70.
- Jingye Li, Hao Fei, Jiang Liu, Shengqiong Wu, Meishan Zhang, Chong Teng, Donghong Ji, and Fei Li. 2022. Unified named entity recognition as word-word relation classification. In proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence, volume 36, pages 10965–10973.
- Xin Li, Dongze Lian, Zhihe Lu, Jiawang Bai, Zhibo Chen, and Xinchao Wang. 2024. Graphadapter: Tuning vision-language models with dual knowledge graph. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 36.

- Yan Li, Yapeng Wang, Xu Yang, and Sio-Kei Im. 2023a. Speech emotion recognition based on graph-lstm neural network. *EURASIP Jour*nal on Audio, Speech, and Music Processing, 2023(1):40.
- Zehan Li, Xin Zhang, Yanzhao Zhang, Dingkun Long, Pengjun Xie, and Meishan Zhang. 2023b. Towards general text embeddings with multistage contrastive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.03281*.
- Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692.
- Christoph Lüscher, Mohammad Zeineldeen, Zijian Yang, Tina Raissi, Peter Vieting, Khai Le-Duc, Weiyue Wang, Ralf Schlüter, and Hermann Ney. 2023. Development of hybrid asr systems for low resource medical domain conversational telephone speech. In Speech Communication; 15th ITG Conference, pages 161–165. VDE.
- Rao Ma, Mengjie Qian, Potsawee Manakul, Mark Gales, and Kate Knill. 2023. Can generative large language models perform asr error correction? arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.04172.
- Yajie Miao, Hao Zhang, and Florian Metze. 2015. Speaker adaptive training of deep neural network acoustic models using i-vectors. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 23(11):1938–1949.
- Hermann Ney, Ute Essen, and Reinhard Kneser. 1994. On structuring probabilistic dependences in stochastic language modelling. *Computer Speech & Language*, 8(1):1–38.
- Nhat Khang Ngo, Truong Son Hy, and Risi Kondor. 2023. Multiresolution graph transformers and wavelet positional encoding for learning longrange and hierarchical structures. *The Journal* of *Chemical Physics*, 159(3).
- Dat Quoc Nguyen and Anh Tuan Nguyen. 2020. PhoBERT: Pre-trained language models for Vietnamese. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 1037–1042.
- Binling Nie, Chenyang Li, and Honglie Wang. 2021. Ka-ner: Knowledge augmented named entity recognition. In Knowledge Graph and Semantic Computing: Knowledge Graph Empowers New Infrastructure Construction: 6th China Conference, CCKS 2021, Guangzhou, China, November 4-7, 2021, Proceedings 6, pages 60–75. Springer.
- Giannis Nikolentzos, George Dasoulas, and Michalis Vazirgiannis. 2020. K-hop graph neural networks. *Neural Networks*, 130:195–205.

- Motoi Omachi, Yuya Fujita, Shinji Watanabe, and Matthew Wiesner. 2021. End-to-end asr to jointly predict transcriptions and linguistic annotations. In Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, pages 1861–1871.
- Stefan Ortmanns, Hermann Ney, and Xavier Aubert. 1997. A word graph algorithm for large vocabulary continuous speech recognition. *Computer Speech & Language*, 11(1):43–72.
- Myle Ott, Sergey Edunov, Alexei Baevski, Angela Fan, Sam Gross, Nathan Ng, David Grangier, and Michael Auli. 2019. fairseq: A fast, extensible toolkit for sequence modeling. In *Proceedings* of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Demonstrations), pages 48–53.
- Shirui Pan, Linhao Luo, Yufei Wang, Chen Chen, Jiapu Wang, and Xindong Wu. 2024. Unifying large language models and knowledge graphs: A roadmap. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering.*
- Daniel S Park, William Chan, Yu Zhang, Chung-Cheng Chiu, Barret Zoph, Ekin D Cubuk, and Quoc V Le. 2019. Specaugment: A simple data augmentation method for automatic speech recognition. *Interspeech*.
- Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, et al. 2019. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. Advances in neural information processing systems, 32.
- Thomas Pellissier Tanon, Denny Vrandečić, Sebastian Schaffert, Thomas Steiner, and Lydia Pintscher. 2016. From freebase to wikidata: The great migration. In *Proceedings of the 25th international conference on world wide web*, pages 1419–1428.
- Ciyuan Peng, Feng Xia, Mehdi Naseriparsa, and Francesco Osborne. 2023. Knowledge graphs: Opportunities and challenges. Artificial Intelligence Review, 56(11):13071–13102.
- Anastasia Pentari, George Kafentzis, and Manolis Tsiknakis. 2024. Speech emotion recognition via graph-based representations. *Scientific Reports*, 14(1):4484.
- Alina Petukhova, Joao P Matos-Carvalho, and Nuno Fachada. 2024. Text clustering with llm embeddings. arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.15112.
- Trang Pham, Truyen Tran, Hoa Dam, and Svetha Venkatesh. 2017. Graph classification via deep learning with virtual nodes. arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.04357.

- Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Tao Xu, Greg Brockman, Christine McLeavey, and Ilya Sutskever. 2023. Robust speech recognition via large-scale weak supervision. In *International* conference on machine learning, pages 28492– 28518. PMLR.
- Ladislav Rampášek, Michael Galkin, Vijay Prakash Dwivedi, Anh Tuan Luu, Guy Wolf, and Dominique Beaini. 2022. Recipe for a general, powerful, scalable graph transformer. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 35:14501–14515.
- David Rybach, Stefan Hahn, Patrick Lehnen, David Nolden, Martin Sundermeyer, Zoltán Tüske, Simon Wiesler, Ralf Schlüter, and Hermann Ney. 2011. RASR - the RWTH Aachen University open source speech recognition toolkit. In 2011 IEEE Workshop on Automatic Speech Recognition & Understanding.
- Takaaki Saeki, Heiga Zen, Zhehuai Chen, Nobuyuki Morioka, Gary Wang, Yu Zhang, Ankur Bapna, Andrew Rosenberg, and Bhuvana Ramabhadran.
  2023. Virtuoso: Massive multilingual speech-text joint semi-supervised learning for text-to-speech. In *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 1–5. IEEE.
- Noam Shazeer. 2020. Glu variants improve transformer. arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.05202.
- Prachi Singh, Amrit Kaul, and Sriram Ganapathy. 2023. Supervised hierarchical clustering using graph neural networks for speaker diarization. In ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), pages 1–5. IEEE.
- Nitish Srivastava, Geoffrey Hinton, Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2014. Dropout: a simple way to prevent neural networks from overfitting. *The journal of machine learning research*, 15(1):1929–1958.
- Thomas Steiner, Ruben Verborgh, Raphaël Troncy, Joaquim Gabarro, and Rik Van de Walle. 2012. Adding realtime coverage to the google knowledge graph. In 11th International Semantic Web Conference (ISWC 2012), volume 914, pages 65– 68. Citeseer.
- Jianlin Su, Murtadha Ahmed, Yu Lu, Shengfeng Pan, Wen Bo, and Yunfeng Liu. 2024. Roformer: Enhanced transformer with rotary position embedding. *Neurocomputing*, 568:127063.
- Dianbo Sui, Zhengkun Tian, Yubo Chen, Kang Liu, and Jun Zhao. 2021. A large-scale chinese multimodal ner dataset with speech clues. In Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural

Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers), pages 2807–2818.

- Guangzhi Sun, Chao Zhang, and Philip C Woodland. 2022. Tree-constrained pointer generator with graph neural network encodings for contextual speech recognition. *Interspeech*.
- Mukuntha Narayanan Sundararaman, Ayush Kumar, and Jithendra Vepa. 2021. Phoneme-bert: Joint language modelling of phoneme sequence and asr transcript. *Interspeech*.
- Piotr Szymański, Lukasz Augustyniak, Mikolaj Morzy, Adrian Szymczak, Krzysztof Surdyk, and Piotr Żelasko. 2023. Why aren't we ner yet? artifacts of asr errors in named entity recognition in spontaneous speech transcripts. In Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), pages 1746–1761.
- Anjali Thukral, Shivani Dhiman, Ravi Meher, and Punam Bedi. 2023. Knowledge graph enrichment from clinical narratives using nlp, ner, and biomedical ontologies for healthcare applications. *International Journal of Information Technology*, 15(1):53–65.
- Ahmet Uyar and Farouk Musa Aliyu. 2015. Evaluating search features of google knowledge graph and bing satori: entity types, list searches and query interfaces. Online Information Review, 39(2):197–213.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. Advances in neural information processing systems, 30.
- Petar Velickovic, Guillem Cucurull, Arantxa Casanova, Adriana Romero, Pietro Lio, Yoshua Bengio, et al. 2017. Graph attention networks. *stat*, 1050(20):10–48550.
- Petar Velickovic, Guillem Cucurull, Arantxa Casanova, Adriana Romero, Pietro Liò, and Yoshua Bengio. 2018. Graph attention networks. In International Conference on Learning Representations.
- Peter Vieting, Christoph Lüscher, Julian Dierkes, Ralf Schlüter, and Hermann Ney. 2023. Efficient utilization of large pre-trained models for low resource asr. In 2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing Workshops (ICASSPW), pages 1–5. IEEE.
- Rohit Voleti, Julie M Liss, and Visar Berisha. 2019. Investigating the effects of word substitution errors on sentence embeddings. In ICASSP 2019-2019 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), pages 7315–7319. IEEE.

- Bo Wang, Tao Shen, Guodong Long, Tianyi Zhou, Ying Wang, and Yi Chang. 2021. Structureaugmented text representation learning for efficient knowledge graph completion. In *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021*, pages 1737– 1748.
- Jixuan Wang, Xiong Xiao, Jian Wu, Ranjani Ramamurthy, Frank Rudzicz, and Michael Brudno. 2020. Speaker diarization with session-level speaker embedding refinement using graph neural networks. In ICASSP 2020-2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), pages 7109–7113. IEEE.
- Liang Wang, Nan Yang, Xiaolong Huang, Linjun Yang, Rangan Majumder, and Furu Wei. 2023. Improving text embeddings with large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.00368.
- Liang Wang, Nan Yang, Xiaolong Huang, Linjun Yang, Rangan Majumder, and Furu Wei. 2024. Multilingual e5 text embeddings: A technical report. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.05672.
- Zhen Wang, Jianwen Zhang, Jianlin Feng, and Zheng Chen. 2014. Knowledge graph and text jointly embedding. In Proceedings of the 2014 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (EMNLP), pages 1591–1601.
- Tongtong Wu, Guitao Wang, Jinming Zhao, Zhaoran Liu, Guilin Qi, Yuan-Fang Li, and Gholamreza Haffari. 2022. Towards relation extraction from speech. arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.08759.
- Hemant Yadav, Sreyan Ghosh, Yi Yu, and Rajiv Ratn Shah. 2020. End-to-end named entity recognition from english speech. *Interspeech*, 2299(1473):3772.
- Michihiro Yasunaga, Hongyu Ren, Antoine Bosselut, Percy Liang, and Jure Leskovec. 2021. Qagnn: Reasoning with language models and knowledge graphs for question answering. In North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (NAACL).
- Chengxuan Ying, Tianle Cai, Shengjie Luo, Shuxin Zheng, Guolin Ke, Di He, Yanming Shen, and Tie-Yan Liu. 2021. Do transformers really perform badly for graph representation? Advances in neural information processing systems, 34:28877–28888.
- Fei Yu, Jiji Tang, Weichong Yin, Yu Sun, Hao Tian, Hua Wu, and Haifeng Wang. 2021. Ernie-vil: Knowledge enhanced vision-language representations through scene graphs. In Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence, volume 35, pages 3208–3216.
- Albert Zeyer, Tamer Alkhouli, and Hermann Ney. 2018. RETURNN as a generic flexible neural toolkit with application to translation and speech

recognition. In Annual Meeting of the Assoc. for Computational Linguistics.

- Yu Zhang, Wei Han, James Qin, Yongqiang Wang, Ankur Bapna, Zhehuai Chen, Nanxin Chen, Bo Li, Vera Axelrod, Gary Wang, et al. 2023. Google usm: Scaling automatic speech recognition beyond 100 languages. arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.01037.
- Yu Zhang, Ron J Weiss, Heiga Zen, Yonghui Wu, Zhifeng Chen, RJ Skerry-Ryan, Ye Jia, Andrew Rosenberg, and Bhuvana Ramabhadran. 2019. Learning to speak fluently in a foreign language: Multilingual speech synthesis and cross-language voice cloning. *Interspeech*.
- Lingfeng Zhong, Jia Wu, Qian Li, Hao Peng, and Xindong Wu. 2023. A comprehensive survey on automatic knowledge graph construction. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 56(4):1–62.
- Xiangru Zhu, Zhixu Li, Xiaodan Wang, Xueyao Jiang, Penglei Sun, Xuwu Wang, Yanghua Xiao, and Nicholas Jing Yuan. 2022. Multi-modal knowledge graph construction and application: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 36(2):715–735.

Contents
----------

1	Introduction	1
2	Data         2.1       Data Collection         2.2       Data Statistics	<b>2</b> 2 2
3	wav2graph3.1ASR Model3.2Node Embeddings3.3Node Classification and Link Prediction3.4GNN Models	<b>3</b> 3 3 3 3
4	Experimental Setups         4.1       ASR Models         4.2       KG and GNN Models         4.3       Evaluation Metrics	<b>4</b> 4 5
5	<ul> <li>Experimental Results</li> <li>5.1 Node Classification on Human Transcript</li> <li>5.1.1 Inductive Learning</li> <li>5.1.2 Transductive Learning</li> <li>5.2 Link Prediction on Human Transcript</li> <li>5.2.1 Inductive Learning</li> <li>5.2.2 Transductive Learning</li> <li>5.2.2 Transductive Learning</li> <li>5.3 Node Classification on ASR Transcript</li> <li>5.3.1 Monolingual Acoustic Pre-training (WER=29.0%)</li> <li>5.4 Link Prediction on ASR Transcript</li> <li>5.4.1 Monolingual Acoustic Pre-training (WER=29.0%)</li> <li>5.4.2 Multilingual Acoustic Pre-training (WER=29.0%)</li> <li>5.4.2 Multilingual Acoustic Pre-training (WER=29.0%)</li> </ul>	<b>5</b> 5 5 5 5 5 6 6 6 6 7 7 7
	5.5 Error Analysis	8
6	Conclusion	8
7	Acknowledgement	9
Α	Related Works	17
в	Details about Experimental SetupsB.1ASR Models	<ol> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>19</li> <li>19</li> </ol>
С	Additional Experimental Results         C.1 Node Classification on Human Transcript         C.2 Link Prediction on Human Transcript         C.3 Node Classification on ASR Transcript         C.3.1 Monolingual Acoustic Pre-training (WER=29.0%)         C.3.2 Multilingual Acoustic Pre-training (WER=28.8%)         C.4 Link Prediction on ASR Transcript	<ol> <li>21</li> <li>23</li> <li>25</li> <li>25</li> <li>27</li> <li>29</li> </ol>

C.4.1	Monolingual Acoustic Pre-training (WER=29.0%)	•							29
C.4.2	Multilingual Acoustic Pre-training (WER=28.8%)				•		•		31

### A Related Works

This section describes works relevant to our *wav2graph* framework.

KG from speech: In the domain of knowledge graph construction, traditional methodologies have predominantly focused on extracting information from textual sources (Zhong et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2021, 2014; Chen et al., 2021). Although there has been progress incorporating multimodal inputs, such as images and text (Zhu et al., 2022; Li et al., 2024; Alberts et al., 2021; Yu et al., 2021), the challenge of directly constructing knowledge graphs from speech data remains largely unexplored. Among the limited number of relevant works we could find to our best knowledge, Fu et al. (2021) introduced what they claimed to be the first automatic KG construction system from speech. Also, Wu et al. (2022) proposed a novel information extraction task, termed speech relation extraction, which utilized extracted relations from synthetic ASR transcripts to construct a KG. However, to the best of our knowledge, no training has been conducted on such KGs. Training KGs is crucial as GNN models can learn to extract and generalize complex patterns and relationships from the data within a KG, thereby enabling predictions on unseen data in the KG—capabilities that rule-based methods alone cannot achieve.

Information extraction from speech: The challenge of accurately identifying entities and their relationships within vast and unstructured data sources persists as a major barrier to broader text-based KG adoption (Peng et al., 2023). Such relationships are typically extracted through NER systems (Li et al., 2022, 2020). However, performing NER on speech, which is necessary for constructing voice-based KGs, remains a significant challenge (Chen et al., 2022; Sui et al., 2021; Szymański et al., 2023; Yadav et al., 2020; Caubrière et al., 2020).

**GNNs for speech applications**: GNNs have shown promise in various speech-related applications. For instance, Wang et al. (2020); Singh et al. (2023) applied GNNs to improve speaker diarization, while Pentari et al. (2024); Joshi et al. (2022); Li et al. (2023a) employed them for speech emotion recognition. Also, GNNs could be used in speaker verification task (Jung et al., 2021; He et al., 2024; Jung et al., 2022) and ASR hypothesis decoding (Dighe et al., 2020; Sun et al., 2022). Despite these advancements, existing GNN-based approaches do not address the direct construction and training of KGs from speech data, which enables the prediction of attributes and relations between spoken utterances.

**GNNs**: Graph representation learning has evolved significantly in recent years, with various approaches designed to incorporate graph structure into meaningful node features. For example, Graph Convolutional Networks (GCN) (Kipf and Welling, 2016) and Message Passing Neural Networks (MPNN) (Gilmer et al., 2017) pioneered this field by proposing the message passing scheme, in which each node aggregates features from the adjacent nodes. Subsequent works like Graph Attention Networks (GAT) (Velickovic et al., 2017) introduced mechanisms to prioritize important nodes. However, these classical approaches often struggle with capturing long-range relationships (Dwivedi et al., 2022). To address this limitation, researchers have explored virtual nodes (Pham et al., 2017; Cai et al., 2023) and k-hop neighborhoods (Nikolentzos et al., 2020) within the message passing framework. More recently, graph transformers have gained prominence, with models such as TokenGT (Kim et al., 2024) and Graphormer (Ying et al., 2021) incorporating sophisticated encodings such as centrality and spatial information. GraphGPS further advanced this approach by combining various positional and structural encodings with multiple graph block types (Rampášek et al., 2022). Additionally, Ngo et al. (2023) proposed a multiscale graph transformer that learns hierarchical graph coarsening and utilizes graph wavelet transforms for positional encoding. These advancements in graph representation learning have significantly improved the ability to capture both local and global graph structures, paving the way for more effective graph-based machine learning models.

### **B** Details about Experimental Setups

This section describes details about experimental setups for experimental reproducibility, which extends the Section 4 in the main paper.

### B.1 ASR Models

This section extends details of Section 4.1 in the main paper.

Gaussian Mixture Model / Hidden Markov Model (GMM/HMM): For language modelling and initial GMM/HMM, we followed the same setups and hyperparameters as in (Lüscher et al., 2023). First, we used the toolkit Sequitur Grapheme-To-Phoneme (g2p) (Bisani and Ney, 2008) to convert pronunciation lexica found in human transcript, so that the seed lexicon was extended, creating the lexica for training. Secondly, we created an n-gram language model using previously extended lexica and human transcript based on Kneser-Ney Smoothing (Ney et al., 1994). Thirdly, we created alignments obtained by using GMM/HMM as labels for wav2vec 2.0 (Baevski et al., 2020b) neural network training, which later resulted to Deep Neural Network / Hidden Markov Model (DNN/HMM) training. The acoustic modeling employed context-dependent phonemic labels, triphones to be specific. In GMM/HMM process, we used a CART (Classification And Regression Tree) (Breiman, 2017) to tie the states s, resulting 4501 CART labels. During GMM/HMM process, we stopped at Speaker Adaptive Training stage (SAT) (Miao et al., 2015) instead of going beyond Speaker Adaptive Training + Vocal Tract Length Normalization (Eide and Gish, 1996) (SAT+VTLN) for the sake of good WER labels:

$$p(x_1^T | w_1^N) = \sum_{[s_1^T]} \prod_{t=1}^T p(x_t, s_t | s_{t-1}, w_1^N)$$

$$= \sum_{[s_1^T]} \prod_{t=1}^T \underbrace{p(s_t | s_{t-1}, w_1^N)}_{\text{transition prob.}} \cdot \underbrace{p(x_t | s_t, s_{t-1}, w_1^N)}_{\text{emission prob.}}$$
(14)

Unsupervised DNN pre-training: For unsupervised DNN pre-training, we used wav2vec 2.0 (Baevski et al., 2020a) as DNN encoder with the help of Fairseq (Ott et al., 2019) toolkit. We employed similar vanilla configurations and hyperparameters as in (Le-Duc, 2023). All models had 118M parameters including 7 Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) (Fukushima, 1979, 1980) layers and 8 Transformer (Vaswani et al., 2017) layers. The last CNN layer had a stride halved for the 8kHz data (Vieting et al., 2023).

**DNN/HMM training**: We loaded unsupervised pre-trained wav2vec 2.0 models for fine-tuning in a supervised DNN/HMM approach. We optimized the model with Framewise Cross-Entropy (fCE) loss. The SpecAugment (Park et al., 2019) data augmentation was applied for the entire 33 fine-tuning epochs. We used RETURNN toolkit (Zeyer et al., 2018) for supervised training. **ASR hypothesis decoding**: The entire ASR hypothesis decoding was done using RASR toolkit (Rybach et al., 2011). In this stage, we integrated the acoustic model with the n-gram language model using Bayes' decision rule and the Viterbi algorithm (Forney, 1973). The Viterbi algorithm recursively computes the optimal path through the alignment graph of all potential word sequences, thereby identifying the best alignment with the acoustic observations. Then, pruning of the acoustic model and the n-gram language model through beam search was employed to focus exclusively on the most likely predicted words at each time step t (Ortmanns et al., 1997). Viterbi algorithm is described as:

$$w_{1}^{N} = \arg \max_{N, w_{1}^{N}} p\Big(\prod_{n=1}^{N} p(w_{n}|w_{n-m}^{n-1}) \\ \cdot \max_{[s_{1}^{T}]} \prod_{t=1}^{T} p(x_{t}, s_{t}|s_{t-1}, w_{1}^{N})\Big)$$
(15)

Monolingual and multilingual pre-training: We utilized two best baseline models for ASR task on the *VietMed* dataset, as described by Le-Duc (2024). The models employed were a monolingual acoustic pre-trained w2v2-Viet and a multilingual acoustic pre-trained XLSR-53-Viet.

The w2v2-Viet model was pre-trained on 1204 hours of unlabeled Vietnamese data, whereas the XLSR-53-Viet model was pre-trained on 1204 hours of unlabeled Vietnamese data with an initialization from the multilingual pre-trained XLSR-53 (Conneau et al., 2021). Both models possess 118M parameters and were fine-tuned using the same training set. Their WERs on the test set were 29.0% and 28.8%, respectively.

# B.2 KG and GNN Models

This section extends details of Section 4.2 in the main paper.

**KG** preprocessing: The KG is preprocessed, involving the identification of entity and relation types, attribute normalization, and potential feature engineering for edge features. The KG consists of two types of nodes: utterance (e.g., "Doctors go to hospital") and named\_entity (e.g., "doctors"(PERSON) and "hospital" (LOCATION)). NEs are extracted from the utterances.

**Hyperparameter Tuning**: Hyperparameter tuning will focus on optimizing the combination of hidden layers and message passing aggregation functions for each GNN model. In the first setting, models will be trained with fixed hyperparameters: 250 epochs (10 epochs for SAGE), a learning rate of 0.005, weight decay of 0.05, Adam optimizer (Kingma and Ba, 2014), and dropout rates (Srivastava et al., 2014) of 0.2 for node classification tasks and 0.5 for link prediction tasks. The same hyperparameters will be applied for both the second and third settings.

# **B.3** Node Embeddings

This section extends details of Section 4.2 in the main paper.

We utilized both encoder-based embeddings, including the English Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-env1.5 (Li et al., 2023b), the multilingual intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct (Wang et al., 2024), and the Vietnamese vinai/phobert-base-v2 (Nguyen and Nguyen, 2020), as well as decoder-based embeddings, such as the multilingual LLM Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen2-7B-instruct (qwe, 2024), in addition to random embeddings (Paszke et al., 2019). We used the following models to get embeddings:

- Random embedding: Features are initialized randomly<sup>2</sup> (Paszke et al., 2019), a tensor filled with random numbers from a normal distribution with mean 0 and variance 1, serving as a baseline for embedding comparison.
- Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5 (Li et al., 2023b): General-purpose general text embeddings with multi-stage contrastive learning that built upon the encoder backbone (BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) + RoPE (Su et al., 2024) + GLU (Shazeer, 2020)).
- intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct (Wang et al., 2024): The opensource multilingual E5 text embedding models, released in mid-2023. The training procedure adheres to the English E5 model recipe, involving contrastive pre-training on 1 billion multilingual text pairs, followed by fine-tuning on a combination of labeled datasets.
- vinai/phobert-base-v2 (Nguyen and Nguyen, 2020): A pre-trained RoBERTa (Liu et al., 2019) language models for Vietnamese.
- Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen2-7B-instruct (qwe, 2024): It is the latest model in the gte (General Text Embedding (Li et al., 2023b)) model family with 7 billion parameters.

# B.4 Details about Evaluation Metrics

**AP** metric: The AP summarizes the precision-recall curve as the weighted mean of precisions achieved at each threshold, with the increase in recall from the previous threshold used as the weight. It provides a single number to summarize the classifier's performance, which is especially useful in the context of imbalanced datasets where one class may be underrepresented. For the

 $<sup>^{2}</sup> https://pytorch.org/docs/stable/generated/torch.randn.html$ 

node classification task, let  $\hat{c}_v$  be the true label of node v and  $c_v$  be the predicted probability of node v belonging to a specific class. For the link prediction task, let  $\hat{e}_{u,v}$  be the true label indicating the presence of an edge between nodes u and v, and  $e_{u,v}$  be the predicted probability of an edge existing between nodes u and v. We then sort the nodes in descending order of their predicted probabilities  $c_v$  and  $e_{u,v}$  respectively. Finally, the AP score is calculated as:

$$AP = \sum_{n} (R_n - R_{n-1})P_n, \qquad (16)$$

where  $P_n$  and  $R_n$  are the precision and recall at the *n*-th threshold, respectively.

**AUC metric**: AUC represents the degree or measure of separability, indicating how much the model is capable of distinguishing between classes. The ROC curve is a graphical plot that illustrates the diagnostic ability of a binary classifier system as its discrimination threshold is varied. TPR(t) and FPR(t) be the true positive rate and false positive rate at threshold t, respectively. The AUC is computed as:

AUC = 
$$\int_0^1 TPR(FPR^{-1}(x)) \, dx.$$
 (17)

This integral calculates the area under the ROC curve.

# C Additional Experimental Results

This section shows the cross-validation loss curves over steps for all GNN models (SAGE, GCN, GAT, and SuperGAT) and all 5 embeddings.

## C.1 Node Classification on Human Transcript

This section shows the cross-validation loss curves of node classification task on human transcript, which are derived from Table 2 in the main paper.



Figure 3: Loss at each iteration with SAGE model.



Figure 4: Loss at each iteration with GCN model.



Figure 5: Loss at each iteration with GAT model.



Figure 6: Loss at each iteration with SuperGAT model.

## C.2 Link Prediction on Human Transcript

This section shows the cross-validation loss curves of link prediction task on human transcript, which are derived from Table 4 in the main paper.



Figure 7: Loss at each iteration with SAGE model.



Figure 8: Loss at each iteration with GCN model.



Figure 9: Loss at each iteration with GAT model.



Figure 10: Loss at each iteration with SuperGAT model.

## C.3 Node Classification on ASR Transcript

# C.3.1 Monolingual Acoustic Pre-training (WER=29.0%)

This section shows the cross-validation loss curves of node classification task on ASR transcript using monolingual acoustic pre-training, which are derived from Table 6 in the main paper.



Figure 11: Loss at each iteration with SAGE model.



Figure 12: Loss at each iteration with GCN model.



Figure 13: Loss at each iteration with GAT model.



Figure 14: Loss at each iteration with SuperGAT model.

# C.3.2 Multilingual Acoustic Pre-training (WER=28.8%)

This section shows the cross-validation loss curves of node classification task on ASR transcript using multilingual acoustic pre-training, which are derived from Table 7 in the main paper.



Figure 15: Loss at each iteration with SAGE model.



Figure 16: Loss at each iteration with GCN model.



Figure 17: Loss at each iteration with GAT model.



Figure 18: Loss at each iteration with SuperGAT model.

## C.4 Link Prediction on ASR Transcript

## C.4.1 Monolingual Acoustic Pre-training (WER=29.0%)

This section shows the cross-validation loss curves of link prediction task on ASR transcript using monolingual acoustic pre-training, which are derived from Table 8 in the main paper.



Figure 19: Loss at each iteration with SAGE model.



Figure 20: Loss at each iteration with GCN model.



Figure 21: Loss at each iteration with GAT model.



Figure 22: Loss at each iteration with SuperGAT model.

# C.4.2 Multilingual Acoustic Pre-training (WER=28.8%)

This section shows the cross-validation loss curves of link prediction task on ASR transcript using multilingual acoustic pre-training, which are derived from Table 9 in the main paper.



Figure 23: Loss at each iteration with SAGE model.



Figure 24: Loss at each iteration with GCN model.



Figure 25: Loss at each iteration with GAT model.



Figure 26: Loss at each iteration with SuperGAT model.