

SignBind-LLM: Multi-Stage Modality Fusion for Sign Language Translation

Marshall Thomas Edward Fish Richard Bowden

CVSSP, University of Surrey
Guildford, Surrey, United Kingdom

{marshall.thomas, edward.fish, r.bowden}@surrey.ac.uk




Figure 1. SignBind-LLM: The first sign language LLM that given a sign language video, simultaneously processes three complementary channels of communication: **Continuous Signing**, **Fingerspelling**, and **Lip Movements**. Each stream is handled by an expert predictor, capturing fine grained linguistic cues often overlooked by traditional single modality approaches. SignBind-LLM then fuses these representations to produce more accurate sign language translations that fully reflect the multimodal nature of signed communication.

Abstract

Despite progress in gloss-free Sign Language Translation (SLT), traditional single modality end-to-end approaches consistently fail on two critical components of natural signing: the precise recognition of high-speed fingerspelling and the integration of asynchronous non-manual cues from the face. Recent progress in SLT with Large Language Models has side stepped this challenge, forcing a single network to learn these simultaneously resulting in poor performance when tasked with translating crucial information such as names, places, and technical terms. We introduce **SignBind-LLM**, a modular framework designed to overcome these limitations. Our approach employs separate, specialized predictors for continuous signing, fingerspelling, and lipreading. Each expert network first decodes its specific modality into a sequence of tokens. These parallel streams are then fused by a lightweight transformer that resolves temporal misalignments before passing the combined representation to a Large Language Model (LLM) for

final sentence generation. Our method establishes a new state-of-the-art on the How2Sign, ChicagoFSWildPlus, and BOBSL datasets with a BLEU-4 score of 22.1, 73.2% letter accuracy and BLEU-4 score of 6.8 respectively. These results validate our core hypothesis: isolating and solving distinct recognition tasks before fusion provides a more powerful and effective pathway to robust, high-fidelity sign language translation.

1. Introduction

Sign languages are fully-fledged natural languages used by millions of Deaf people worldwide. Sign languages rely on manual gestures (handshapes, movements, and locations) and non-manual signals (facial expressions, mouthings, and mouth gestures¹). Languages like American Sign Language (ASL), British Sign Language (BSL), and German Sign

¹In sign language linguistics, *mouthing* denotes silent articulation of spoken words that accompany signs, while *mouth gestures* are non-verbal movements integral to the sign itself, conveying grammatical or affective

Language (DGS) [5, 19, 25] each possess their own lexicon, grammar, fingerspelling method, and mouthings.

Early methods focused on Isolated Sign Language Recognition (ISLR), typically required expertly annotated glosses and details English translations for individual signs [6]. While the advent of large, gloss-free datasets (e.g., YouTube-ASL [61], Public DGS [26], How2Sign [11]) and the integration of large language models (LLMs) [37] have moved the field toward end-to-end Sign Language Translation (SLT), two pervasive challenges continue to limit real-world performance:

Fingerspelling: Fingerspelling is a critical component of all sign languages and is often used for proper names, technical terms, and loanwords. This constitutes a significant portion of signing (e.g., 12–35% of ASL [62]). However, current gloss-free SLT systems [36, 39], treat it as a subordinate task within the main translation pipeline while other SOTA methods ignore it entirely [14, 35]. As a result, fingerspelled terms are frequently mistranslated.

Non-Manual Cues: Mouthings and facial expressions carry crucial disambiguating information, akin to phonemes or visemes in speech [12, 43]. Yet, existing SLT models rarely utilize these powerful signals. The key challenge in integrating these features in end-to-end approaches is that they are not aligned with manual signs, particularly during fingerspelling.

In contrast to advances in Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR) [38] and Visual Speech Recognition (VSR) [59], which leverage massive pretraining and powerful architectures, sign language systems remain constrained. This discrepancy is primarily due to (a) data scarcity; (b) the spatio-temporal complexity of co-articulated gestures; and critically, (c) the unaddressed temporal offset between these manual and non-manual signals.

To overcome these fundamental limitations, we introduce **SignBind-LLM**, a novel gloss-free SLT framework built on a paradigm of multi-modal, parallel-stream processing. The novelty lies in its dedicated, three-pronged architecture designed to explicitly solve the issue of non-manual misalignment, temporal variance, fingerspelling recognition, and the integration of lipreading. We make the following contributions:

Dedicated Modality Streams: We implement three specialized processing streams. One for continuous sign, one dedicated sub-network for fine-grained fingerspelling detection, and one dedicated visual speech recognition (lipreading) component which are pre-trained independently for their respective tasks.

Asynchronicity-Aware Fusion Encoder: We introduce a lightweight transformer encoder equipped with a learnable gating mechanism that dynamically weighs the contribution of each visual stream before temporal integration. The Fu-

sion Encoder adaptively balances information from the active modality (i.e signing or fingerspelling) and the lipreading branch, enabling the model to emphasize the most informative cues under varying temporal asynchrony.

Contextual LLM Decoding: We train a specialised LLM for decoding fused representations in sign gloss order to English sentences, generating contextually accurate and fluent translations without relying on any direct gloss supervision. We further provide LLM generated pseudo-gloss annotations and phonemes for the 1.5M sentences in BOBSL [1] and 35k in How2Sign [11].

We demonstrate the efficacy of this new paradigm on How2Sign, ChicagoFSWildPlus, and BOBSL, with large improvements over SOTA end-to-end approaches (+6.6 B4 on How2Sign and +4.2 B4 on BOBSL). Our findings demonstrate that combining modality-specific, parallel predictors with an LLM decoder is the scalable path forward for high-quality translation of real-world signed content.

2. Related Work

2.1. Sign Language Understanding

Sign Language Understanding (SLU) has evolved through three increasingly ambitious tasks:

Isolated Sign Language Recognition (ISLR): Early work focused on recognizing individual signs in controlled settings. Methods such as 3D CNNs over spatiotemporal volumes [41] and hybrid CNN-HMM pipelines [32] achieved high accuracy on small vocabularies (e.g., 100–500 signs), but relied on carefully segmented clips and extensive manual gloss annotations.

Continuous Sign Language Recognition (CSLR): To scale beyond isolated signs, CSLR methods adopted sequence-level training with Connectionist Temporal Classification (CTC) loss [23]. Recurrent architectures (CNN-BiLSTM-CTC) [22] and, more recently, Transformer encoders [41] enabled end-to-end gloss prediction from unsegmented video. While these models tolerate variable sign durations, they still depend on gloss-level transcripts which are costly to annotate. Furthermore CSLR methods often struggle with out-of-vocabulary signs and fingerspelling.

Sign Language Translation (SLT): SLT goes one step further by generating natural language sentences directly from sign video. SLT methods can largely be categorised into two groups. Gloss-based SLT pipelines [7, 67, 68] utilise sign-aligned annotated data to predict gloss sequences as in the CSLR case above. These can then be used as input via a sequence-to-sequence model [6] to improve translation quality. Examples include CNN-LSTM-attention frameworks that achieve fluent translation but inherit errors

from the gloss recognizer. Alternatively, Gloss-free SLT [3, 10, 21, 39, 71] bypasses intermediate glosses, learning a direct video-to-text mapping. Gloss-free methods have the advantage that they can leverage large datasets without accurate and aligned gloss-level translations. This enables large-scale video–text pretraining [37, 58, 70, 71] and multimodal contrastive objectives [24] to improve translation fluency. More recent approaches have focussed on leveraging LLM’s language modelling capabilities to incorporate sign features either from RGB [61], Pose [14], or a fusion of both modalities [35, 63]. However, these models often underperform on fingerspelling and non-manual cues, since they attempt to learn all visual subtasks in a single end-to-end network.

2.2. Lipreading and Visual Speech Recognition

Lipreading, or visual speech recognition (VSR), can complement sign language understanding by capturing silent speech cues. Modern systems employ deep learning-based architectures. LipNet [50] introduced an end-to-end model using spatiotemporal CNNs [8, 33] and BiLSTMs [22], achieving state-of-the-art sentence-level lipreading performance. Transformer-based models, such as Lipformer [64], further improved contextual understanding across video frames. Recent advances leverage self-supervised learning and multimodal fusion to enhance lipreading robustness. AV-HuBERT [52] demonstrated the efficacy of large-scale audiovisual pretraining, achieving strong performance under challenging conditions [59]. However, lipreading remains underexplored in the context of fingerspelling and full-sentence SLT, despite mouthing cues carrying up to 40% of linguistic information in natural sign production (e.g., lexical disambiguation, grammatical markers) [2].

2.3. Multimodal Approaches

Multimodal learning has emerged as a promising approach to improve SLT by integrating visual, linguistic, and contextual information [29]. Previous systems fused RGB video, pose sequences, and optical flow [14] to enhance recognition accuracy. Recent works such as GFSLT-VLP [70] incorporated video-text contrastive learning and cross-modal attention mechanisms to bridge the gap between sign language and natural language representations.

However, current fingerspelling detection methods remain focused on hand centric cues and fail to leverage the rich information present in lip movements. Approaches such as synthetic data augmentation [15], large “in-the-wild” collections [20, 69], and pose-based models achieve moderate accuracy on isolated letter streams but do not integrate mouthings. This design overlooks the well-documented co-articulation between handshapes and lip movements in natural signing [2], leading to persistent errors on homonymous handshapes (e.g., “M” vs. “N”) and

proper-noun detection. To date, no SLT system has explicitly fused high-resolution fingerspelling and lipreading streams while accounting for their temporal misalignment.

2.4. LLMs in SLT and VSR

The rise of Large Language Models (LLMs) has revolutionized sign language understanding, fingerspelling detection, and lipreading by leveraging vast linguistic knowledge and multimodal learning capabilities. In SLT, LLMs have been employed to bridge the gap between sign video sequences and natural language text [14, 35]. Newer approaches [48] applied transformer-based architectures to generate coherent text from sign videos, outperforming traditional gloss-based approaches. For fingerspelling detection, LLMs have facilitated cross-modal learning by aligning hand gestures with corresponding textual representations [51, 57]. These approaches demonstrated that LLMs can effectively enhance fingerspelling recognition by integrating linguistic and visual modalities but they have not previously been combined with lipreading.

In lipreading, LLMs have been integrated into audiovisual speech recognition pipelines to improve contextual understanding and transcription accuracy [59]. The first approach to utilize LLM-based encoders [65] enhanced lipreading robustness, even under challenging conditions.

Despite progress in each of these individual modality streams and the recent availability of large sign language datasets and language models, no-one has yet proposed a method which combines lipreading, fingerspelling, and sign recognition in a unified framework for SLT.

3. Method

We propose **SignBind-LLM**, a novel sign language translation framework that decomposes the complex translation task into specialized sub-tasks before fusion. Our key insight is that sign languages employ distinct communication channels—continuous signing, fingerspelling, and mouthings—that benefit from dedicated modeling before integration. We achieve this through a four-stage pipeline: (1) Target Generation via Text Pre-processing, (2) Modality-Specific Pre-training, (3) Multi-modal Fusion, and (4) Language Model Refinement.

Figure 3 illustrates our complete architecture.

3.1. Problem Formulation

Given an input video sequence of Sign Language $\mathbf{X} = \{x_1, \dots, x_T\}$, where $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times 3}$ represents frame t , our primary objective is to produce an English translation $\mathbf{S} = \{s_1, \dots, s_K\}$. We formally decompose this mapping, \mathcal{F} , into a series of specialized functions:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F} : \mathbf{X} &\rightarrow \{\mathcal{F}_{\text{sign}}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{fs}}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{lip}}\} \\ &\rightarrow \mathbf{G}_{\text{fused}} \rightarrow \mathbf{S} \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$




Figure 2. Our method consists of four stages. First we perform text pre-processing, where pseudo-glosses are generated using an LLM then phonemized for lipreading. In parallel, we extract both full frame sign sequences and cropped face regions. Second, we pre-train the model’s specialized predictors: continuous signing, using the extracted pseudo-glosses, fingerspelling, using a sequence of English letters and lipreading, using the extracted phonemes. A sequence classifier determines whether the given segment corresponds to signing, fingerspelling, or resting. Third, these representations are then gated and fused within a transformer-based Fusion Encoder; which is also trained on the pseudo-glosses, aligning complementary cues across modalities. Finally, the fused pseudo-gloss sequence is passed to a fine-tuned LLM to generate coherent spoken-language sentences.

Here, $\mathcal{F}_{\text{sign}}$, \mathcal{F}_{fs} , and \mathcal{F}_{lip} denote the expert functions for continuous signing, fingerspelling, and lipreading. Their outputs are integrated into a unified pseudo-gloss representation $\mathbf{G}_{\text{fused}}$, which is finally translated into the target sentence \mathbf{S} .

3.2. Stage 1: Target Generation via Text Pre-processing

A significant barrier to multi-stream modeling is the lack of parallel, granular annotations. We overcome this by automatically generating three complementary training targets directly from English subtitles $\mathbf{S} = \{w_1, \dots, w_L\}$.

Pseudo-Gloss Generation: To create a compact and linguistically relevant target for the sign recognition task, we employ GPT-4o [47] to transform English sentences into ASL-ordered pseudo-glosses. This process removes function words and reorders content to match common signing patterns.

$$\mathbf{G} = \text{LLM}_{\text{gloss}}(\mathbf{S}) = \{g_1, \dots, g_M\} \quad (2)$$

Here, $M \leq L$ reflects the removal of semantically redundant elements such as articles, and the re-ordering to subject, object, verb structure.

Phoneme Extraction: Mouthings provide critical disambiguation for visually similar signs. To supervise our lipreading module, we extract phoneme sequences from the

generated pseudo-glosses:

$$\mathbf{P} = \text{Phonemize}(\mathbf{G}) = \{p_1, \dots, p_N\} \quad (3)$$

Each p_i represents an English phoneme, enabling our model to learn the fine-grained articulatory motions of mouthed words.

Fingerspelling Identification: For the Fingerspelling labels we use the ChicagoFSWild+ dataset and split the words into individual character sequences such that $\mathbf{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$. Each f_i represents a character in the word label, enabling the model to learn each letter in the alphabet. We also isolate sequences that contain potential fingerspelling from the psuedo-glosses by applying rule-based detection to \mathbf{G} . We do this by identifying proper nouns and technical terms, which are typically fingerspelled.

3.3. Stage 2: Modality-Specific Encoders

This stage defines the “expert” networks that learn to recognize each specific communication channel.

Video Pre-processing: We process the input video into two distinct streams to feed the appropriate experts. We use MediaPipe [40] to extract both the full frames \mathbf{X}_{full} (for manual signs) and tightly-cropped face frames \mathbf{X}_{face} (for lipreading).

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{X}_{\text{full}} &\in \mathbb{R}^{B \times T \times 3 \times 224 \times 224} \\ \mathbf{X}_{\text{face}} &\in \mathbb{R}^{B \times T \times 3 \times 224 \times 224} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Both streams are normalized with a resolution of 224×224 , where B is the batch size.

Shared Backbone and Manual Experts: The core of our visual encoder is a single DINOv2 backbone [42] that processes the full-frame stream from \mathbf{X}_{full} . The features extracted from this backbone, $\mathbf{H}_{\text{manual}}$, are shared, serving as the input for three independent parallel heads.

Dynamic Sequence Routing: A key innovation of our work is a dynamic routing module that operates on the shared backbone features $\mathbf{H}_{\text{manual}}$. We find that applying all experts to all frames is inefficient and introduces noise and so we train a lightweight classifier to route segments to the correct expert: {Sign, Fingerspelling, Rest}.

First, we apply temporal-average pooling to the DINOv2 features $\mathbf{H}_{\text{manual}}$ to get a sequence-level representation, A small MLP head then processes this feature to produce class logits.

$$\hat{\mathbf{c}}_{\text{logits}} = \mathbf{W}_{\text{cls}} \mathbf{h}_{\text{avg}} + \mathbf{b}_{\text{cls}} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times 3} \quad (5)$$

To maintain differentiability for training, we use the Gumbel-Softmax [28] reparameterization trick on the raw logits to obtain a one-hot-like selection vector \mathbf{g} :

$$\mathbf{g} = \text{GumbelSoftmax}(\hat{\mathbf{c}}_{\text{logits}}, \tau) = [g_{\text{sign}}, g_{\text{fs}}, g_{\text{rest}}] \quad (6)$$

where τ is the temperature parameter. This routing vector is passed to the fusion stage (Stage 3) to dynamically weight the *outputs* of the expert heads.

Continuous Sign Recognition: In parallel with the router, the continuous signing expert processes the full, unpooled DINOv2 features. We add positional embeddings (PE) and pass the features through a dedicated linear head to project to the sign vocabulary size $|\mathcal{V}_{\text{sign}}|$:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{\text{manual}} &= \text{Dropout}(\mathbf{H}_{\text{manual}} + \mathbf{PE}) \\ \hat{\mathbf{L}}_{\text{sign}} &= \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{\text{manual}} \mathbf{W}_{\text{sign}} + \mathbf{b}_{\text{sign}} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times T \times |\mathcal{V}_{\text{sign}}|} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Fingerspelling Detection: Similarly, the fingerspelling expert processes the same position-encoded features, $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{\text{manual}}$, but uses its own dedicated linear head to produce logits $\hat{\mathbf{L}}_{\text{fs}}$ over the 26 characters of the alphabet:

$$\hat{\mathbf{L}}_{\text{fs}} = \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{\text{manual}} \mathbf{W}_{\text{fs}} + \mathbf{b}_{\text{fs}} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times T \times 26} \quad (8)$$

Lipreading Module: The lipreading expert processes the face-cropped stream \mathbf{X}_{face} . We employ a masked ViT (ViT_{lip}) with a 50% masking ratio to force the model to learn robust representations. A 1D convolution then performs temporal adaptation, and a final linear layer projects to the phoneme vocabulary $|\mathcal{P}|$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Z} &= \text{ViT}_{\text{lip}}(\text{Mask}(\mathbf{X}_{\text{face}}, 0.5)) \\ \mathbf{G} &= \text{Conv1D}(\mathbf{Z}) \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times T' \times d_{\text{adapter}}} \\ \hat{\mathbf{L}}_{\text{lip}} &= \text{Linear}(\mathbf{G}) \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times T' \times |\mathcal{P}|} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Note that the temporal dimension $T' < T$ due to the convolutional pooling.

3.4. Stage 3: Temporal-Aware Multi-modal Fusion

This stage addresses the core challenge of fusing our asynchronous experts. First, we project all outputs to a common dimension and align their temporal lengths. The lipreading logits \mathbf{L}_{lip} are upsampled from T' to T :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}_{\text{sign}} &= \phi_{\text{sign}}(\hat{\mathbf{L}}_{\text{sign}}) \\ \mathbf{E}_{\text{fs}} &= \phi_{\text{fs}}(\hat{\mathbf{L}}_{\text{fs}}) \\ \mathbf{E}_{\text{lip}} &= \phi_{\text{lip}}(\text{Upsample}(\hat{\mathbf{L}}_{\text{lip}}, T)) \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Gated Manual Feature Aggregation: We use the routing vector \mathbf{g} from Stage 2 to create a single, unified manual representation \mathbf{M} . This dynamically selects the correct expert output (sign or fingerspelling) for each segment.

$$\mathbf{M} = g_{\text{sign}} \odot \mathbf{E}_{\text{sign}} + g_{\text{fs}} \odot \mathbf{E}_{\text{fs}} + g_{\text{rest}} \odot \mathbf{n}_{\text{null}} \quad (11)$$

Here, \odot denotes element-wise multiplication, and \mathbf{n}_{null} is a learned null vector to represent rest periods.

Adaptive Feature Gating: The relative importance of manual signs versus mouthings is context-dependent. We learn this balance with an adaptive gating mechanism. A learned gate α controls the information flow from the manual stream \mathbf{M} and the lip stream \mathbf{E}_{lip} :

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= \sigma(\mathbf{W}_g [\mathbf{M}; \mathbf{E}_{\text{lip}}] + \mathbf{b}_g) \\ \mathbf{H}_{\text{fused}} &= \alpha \odot \mathbf{M} + (1 - \alpha) \odot \mathbf{E}_{\text{lip}} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $[\cdot; \cdot]$ denotes feature concatenation.

Transformer-based Temporal Modelling: The resulting fused features $\mathbf{H}_{\text{fused}}$ are passed through a final TransformerEncoder to model long-range temporal dependencies, producing the final contextual representation \mathbf{Z} :

$$\mathbf{Z} = \text{TransformerEncoder}(\mathbf{H}_{\text{fused}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times T \times d} \quad (13)$$

This fusion module is trained to produce the correct pseudo-gloss sequence $\hat{\mathbf{G}}$ via a final CTC loss:

$$\hat{\mathbf{G}} = \text{CTC-Decode}(\text{Softmax}(\mathbf{W}_{\text{out}} \mathbf{Z} + \mathbf{b}_{\text{out}})) \quad (14)$$

3.5. Stage 4: Language Model Refinement

The fused representation $\hat{\mathbf{G}}$ is a sequence of pseudo-glosses, which is not representative of spoken English. The final stage employs a language model, LLM_{θ} , to translate this intermediate representation into the final sentence $\hat{\mathbf{S}}$ where $\hat{\mathbf{S}} = \text{LLM}_{\theta}(\hat{\mathbf{G}})$. This model is trained *independently* of the visual pipeline. We pre-train LLM_{θ} on a large corpus of (pseudo-gloss, English sentence) pairs (\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S}) generated in Stage 1. This decoupled approach allows the LLM to learn a robust linguistic mapping that generalizes well to the noisy gloss outputs $\hat{\mathbf{G}}$ produced by the visual model at inference time.

3.6. Training Strategy

Our curriculum is strictly staged to ensure stable convergence and component specialization. We do not use a single, joint end-to-end loss. Instead, each module is trained independently, with its parameters frozen before being used by the next stage. This process is applied in two phases: pre-training and fine-tuning.

Phase 1: Stage-wise Pre-training: We first pre-train each component on large-scale, diverse datasets (e.g., YouTube-ASL [61], ChicagoFSWild+).

1. **Train Experts:** The Sequence Classifier \mathcal{L}_{cls} , Sign Encoder \mathcal{L}_{sign}^{CTC} , FS Encoder \mathcal{L}_{fs}^{CTC} , and Lipreading module \mathcal{L}_{lip}^{CTC} are all trained separately on their respective targets from Stage 1. The losses for this stage are defined as:

$$\mathcal{L}_m = CTC(L_m, T_m), \quad m \in \{fs, sign, lip\} \quad (15)$$

where L_m are the output logits from branch m and T_m the corresponding ground truth token sequence.

2. **Freeze Experts & Train Fusion:** After the experts are trained, their weights are **frozen**. The Fusion Module is then trained on the *frozen outputs* of the experts to optimize \mathcal{L}_{fusion} . The loss for the fusion is defined as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{fusion} = CTC(\hat{G}_t, Y_t) \quad (16)$$

3. **Train LLM:** Separately, the Language Model is pre-trained on all available (**G**, **S**) text pairs to optimize \mathcal{L}_{LLM} using standard Cross Entropy Loss.

Phase 2: Stage-Wise Fine-tuning: We repeat the same staged process on the smaller, high-quality fine-tuning dataset (e.g., How2Sign [11]).

1. **Fine-tune Experts:** The pre-trained experts are fine-tuned on the How2Sign data, again using their independent losses.
2. **Freeze Experts & Fine-tune Fusion:** The fine-tuned expert weights are **frozen**. The pre-trained Fusion Module is then fine-tuned on their outputs.
3. **LLM:** The LLM is already fully trained and remains **frozen** during this phase.

This decoupled, staged methodology ensures that each component becomes a robust expert at its specific task before its outputs are used to train subsequent modules.

4. Experiments

4.1. Datasets

For ASL we pre-trained our model using the Youtube-ASL dataset and ChicagoFSWild+, then fine-tuned it on How2Sign. We then evaluated our proposed framework on How2Sign and ChicagoFSWild+. For BSL we trained and evaluated our model on BOBSL [1].

YouTube-ASL [61]: A large-scale ASL dataset comprising 60K videos and 1,000 hours sourced from YouTube,

annotated with sentence-level transcriptions. This dataset provides diverse signing conditions, including variations in background, lighting, and signer appearance. The dataset features over 2,500 unique signers, ensuring that the model generalizes well across different users.

ChicagoFSWildPlus [4]: A dataset containing 55,232 ASL finger-spelling sequences performed by 260 signers containing in-the-wild videos of fingerspelling sequences. It includes multiple signers, varied environments, and occlusions, which makes it ideal for evaluating the robustness of fingerspelling detection.

How2Sign [11]: How2Sign is a large-scale, continuous ASL corpus derived from 2,456 instructional ‘‘How2’’ videos, totaling over 80 hours of footage. Recordings were made in two settings: a Green-Screen studio (79.1 h over 2,529 videos) and the Panoptic studio (2.96 h over 124 videos). Eleven signers (5 hearing ASL interpreters, 2 hard-of-hearing, 4 Deaf) produced 35,191 sentence-level clips (average 162 frames/5.4 s, 17 words), yielding a vocabulary of over 16,000 English words.

BOBSL [1]: A large-scale video dataset consisting of British Sign Language from BSL interpreted BBC broadcast footage. The data features 39 unique interpreters from 1,962 episodes across 426 TV shows, resulting in approximately 1,467 hours of video content. The videos are annotated with English subtitles approximately 1.2M sentences.

4.2. Evaluation Metrics

We evaluated model performance using several common metrics: Letter Accuracy [18], BLEU Score [46] and ROUGE [17]. For all metrics higher scores demonstrate improved performance.

5. Results

In this section we compare the performance of SignBind-LLM with several state-of-the-art models from recent literature. Table 1 and Table 2 show the comparison between our approach and other approaches in SLT on How2Sign and BOBSL respectively. Table 3 shows the comparison for fingerspelling on the ChicagoFSWildPlus dataset.

5.1. Qualitative Results

Figure 3 shows three example translations, with the outputs from each stream. It also shows where the translation process fails and how the fusion transformer helps to remedy this. Finally the figure shows how the LLM generates the spoken-English sentence from the fusion predictions. We observe that the mouthed features provide a strong signal for the fusion encoder, while the LLM is effective at correcting grammatical errors in the translation.

Model	Modality		Test on How2Sign		
	Pose	RGB	BLEU-1 \uparrow	BLEU-4 \uparrow	ROUGE \uparrow
GloFE-VN [37]	✓		14.9	2.2	12.6
MSLU [71]	✓	✓	20.1	2.4	17.2
SLT-IV [58]		✓	34.0	8.0	-
C ² RL [9]		✓	29.1	9.4	27.0
FLa-LLM [10]		✓	29.8	9.7	-
YouTube-ASL [61]	✓		37.8	12.4	-
SignMusketeers [24]		✓	41.5	14.3	-
Uni-Sign [35]	✓	✓	40.2	14.9	36.0
Geo-Sign [14]	✓		40.8	15.1	35.4
SSVP-SLT [49]		✓	<u>43.2</u>	<u>15.5</u>	<u>38.4</u>
SignBind-LLM (Ours)		✓	49.4	22.1	41.2

Table 1. Modality (pose / RGB) and BLEU / ROUGE comparison on How2Sign. SignBind-LLM achieves the best scores across all metrics.

Model	B1	B4	R-L
GFSLT [70]	-	0.6	7.4
Sign2GPT [63]	-	0.9	11.4
Albanie [1]	12.78	1.0	10.2
Sincan [56]	18.8	1.3	8.9
Lost in Translation [29]	12.78	2.6	15.6
SignBind-LLM (Ours)	27.9	6.8	24.9

Table 2. Comparison on BOBSL in BLEU-1, BLEU-4, and ROUGE-L. SignBind-LLM performed best across all metrics.

Model	Letter Accuracy
FS Recognition [53]	41.2%
Iterative Attention [54]	46.7%
Pannattee et al. [44]	48.0%
Gajurel et al. [16]	48.4%
TDC-SL [45]	50.0%
FS Attention [30]	57.8%
FSS-Net [55]	64.4%
CtoML [34]	54.9%
FS PoseNet [13]	71.1%
SignBind-LLM (Ours)	73.2%

Table 3. Letter accuracy results on ChicagoFSWildPlus. SignBind-LLM outperforms all previous approaches, improving over the strongest prior model by 2.1 percentage points.

5.2. Ablation Study

In this section, we discuss the different ablation studies performed to demonstrate the contribution of the various components in the architecture.

Model Variants: The first ablation was to understand the contribution of each component and the importance of each modality. We conducted an ablation study by selectively disabling key features of SignBind-LLM and comparing the results. Table 4 presents the results. We identify that the fusion network and LLM are key for improving performance, while lipreading is the most important modality.

Model Variant	L-Acc. (%)	B-4
W/o Lipreading	54.3	13.6
W/o Fingerspelling	33.7	18.9
W/o Fusion	49.8	8.6
W/o Sequencer	51.2	14.3
W/o LLM	58.8	7.8
Full Model	73.2	22.1

Table 4. Comparison of Letter Accuracy and BLEU-4 score when different components are removed from the model. This shows that the components that have the largest effect on model performance are the Fusion Transformer and the LLM, this is because the Fusion transformer has the largest effect on the pseudo-gloss outputs and the LLM is needed to fill in the blanks and reorder these outputs into spoken English, which is important for the B-4 metric.

Stand-alone Effectiveness: This ablation focuses on the effectiveness of the two primary experts, the continuous sign predictor and the Lipreading predictor. Table 5 shows the phoneme prediction performance and continuous sign prediction performance of the model on the How2Sign dataset from the sign CTC branch directly. We observe that lipreading is a critical component of the network delivering most of the performance improvement during fusion. The low continuous sign score can also be attributed to the mis-

GT	Split the energy. One up, One down.				You should always, already be down there			My name's Ryan Parker			
Sign	Spirit	Bent	Up	Down	Car	House	Red	Name	R	A	
Mouth	s p l t d h a h e h n e r w a h n a h p w a h n d a w				y u w s h u h d a o l e y a o r e h i y b i y d a w d h e h,			m n e y z r a y n p a a r k i h			
Fused	SPLIT ENERGY ONE UP ONE DOWN				SHOULD ALWAYS READY DOWN			MY NAME RYAN PARKER			
LLM	Split the energy one is up one is down				You should always be ready down			My name is Ryan Parker			

Figure 3. An example of the translation process from How2Sign. In the output we can see how the sign model makes a number of errors in its predictions and how these are resolved into accurate pseudo-glosses by the fusion process using the phonemes from the lipreading. Then how they are used by the LLM to generate a coherent spoken English sentence.

alignment between this branch and the English translation before the LLM reordering.

Model	Pho.-Acc. (%)	B-4
Continuous Sign	-	6.3
Lipreading	65.6	-

Table 5. Ablation results showing Phoneme accuracy (Pho) and BLEU-4 performance of individual input modalities on the How2Sign dataset.

Varying LLMs: The next ablation was to compare the effectiveness of different LLMs, fully fine-tuned with different parameter sizes. Table 6 shows the results of this study.

Model	Params (B)	L-Acc. (%)	B-4
Llama 3.2-1B	1.0	60.9	12.1
Llama 3.2-3B	3.0	64.8	16.4
Llama 2-7B	7.0	73.2	22.1

Table 6. Comparison of Letter Accuracy and BLEU-4 scores for different LLMs (Parameters in billions) tested with our model. The model with the worst performance is the 1 Billion parameter model with a drop in Letter Accuracy of 12.3 and BLEU of 10.

Asynchronous Fusion: The penultimate ablation focuses on the effectiveness of the fusion model. The aim is to quantify how sensitive our fusion mechanism is to the temporal misalignment that naturally occurs between hand movements (manual signals) and mouth movements (non-manual cues) in real sign language. To quantify this we test with four different temporal shifts:

1. No shift: Directly fuse frame t of lips with frame t of hands, no temporal shift at all
2. $\Delta \pm 5$ frames: fuse frame t of hands with lip $t \pm 3$ frames

3. $\Delta \pm 10$ frames: fuse frame t of hands with lip $t \pm 5$ frames
4. Learned Alignment: The model learn an optimal per-time fusion gating

Variant	L-Acc. (%)	B-4
No shift	68.3	17.2
$\Delta + 5$	62.8	12.4
$\Delta - 5$	70.6	18.1
$\Delta + 10$	55.7	7.8
$\Delta - 10$	64.9	15.6
Learned alignment	73.2	22.1

Table 7. Effect of temporal alignment between manual and non-manual streams. The learned alignment yields the highest Letter Accuracy and BLEU-4, while large positive shifts (e.g., +10) degrade performance the most.

6. Conclusion

We introduced SignBind-LLM, a modular framework that redefines gloss-free Sign Language Translation through explicit multi-stage fusion of continuous signing, finger-spelling, and lipreading. By decomposing SLT into dedicated expert streams and resolving their temporal asynchrony via a lightweight transformer, our model achieves state-of-the-art results on How2Sign (BLEU-4 of 22.1), BOBSL (BLEU-4 of 6.8) and ChicagoFSWildPlus (73.2% letter accuracy). Our findings validate that isolating and reconciling heterogeneous visual-linguistic cues before fusion leads to SOTA performance on sign language translation.

7. Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the SNSF project ‘SMILE II’ (CRSII5 193686), the Innosuisse ICT Flagship (PFFS-21 47), EPSRC grant APP24554 (SignGPT-EP/Z535370/1)

and through funding from Google.org via the AI for Global Goals scheme. This work reflects only the author’s views and the funders are not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains. Thank you to Oline Ranum for help with the parts of Speech analysis.

References

- [1] Samuel Albanie, Gül Varol, Liliane Momeni, Hannah Bull, Triantafyllos Afouras, Himel Chowdhury, Neil Fox, Bencie Woll, Rob Cooper, Andrew McParland, and Andrew Zisserman. BOBSL: BBC-Oxford British Sign Language Dataset. 2021. [2](#), [6](#), [7](#)
- [2] Mario Aparicio, Philippe Peigneux, Brigitte Charlier, Danielle Balériaux, Martin Kavec, and Jacqueline Leybaert. The neural basis of speech perception through lipreading and manual cues: Evidence from deaf native users of cued speech. *Neuropsychologia*, 2017. [3](#)
- [3] Sobhan Asasi, Mohamed Ilyes Lakhal, and Richard Bowden. Hierarchical feature alignment for gloss-free sign language translation. In *Adjunct Proceedings of the 25th ACM International Conference on Intelligent Virtual Agents*, 2025. [3](#)
- [4] J. Keane D. Brentari G. Shakhnarovich B. Shi, A. Martinez Del Rio and K. Livescu. Fingerspelling recognition in the wild with iterative visual attention. *ICCV*, 2019. [6](#)
- [5] British Sign Language. British sign language resources. <https://www.british-sign.co.uk/>, 2024. [2](#)
- [6] Necati Cihan Camgoz, Simon Hadfield, Oscar Koller, Hermann Ney, and Richard Bowden. Neural sign language translation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2018. [2](#)
- [7] Necati Cihan Camgoz, Oscar Koller, Simon Hadfield, and Richard Bowden. Sign language transformers: Joint end-to-end sign language recognition and translation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2020. [2](#), [6](#)
- [8] Joao Carreira and Andrew Zisserman. Quo vadis, action recognition? a new model and the kinetics dataset. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2017. [3](#)
- [9] Zhigang Chen, Benjia Zhou, Yiqing Huang, Jun Wan, Yibo Hu, Hailin Shi, Yanyan Liang, Zhen Lei, and Du Zhang. C2rl: Content and context representation learning for gloss-free sign language translation and retrieval. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 2024. [7](#), [2](#), [3](#), [6](#)
- [10] Zhigang Chen, Benjia Zhou, Jun Li, Jun Wan, Zhen Lei, Ning Jiang, Quan Lu, and Guoqing Zhao. Factorized learning assisted with large language model for gloss-free sign language translation. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, 2024. [3](#), [7](#), [6](#)
- [11] Amanda Duarte, Shruti Palaskar, Lucas Ventura, Deepti Ghadiyaram, Kenneth DeHaan, Florian Metze, Jordi Torres, and Xavier Giro-i Nieto. How2Sign: A Large-scale Multimodal Dataset for Continuous American Sign Language. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2021. [2](#), [6](#)
- [12] Britannica Editors. Phoneme. Encyclopedia Britannica, 2025. [2](#)
- [13] Pooya Fayyazsanavi, Negar Nejatishahidin, and Jana Košecká. Fingerspelling posenet: Enhancing fingerspelling translation with pose-based transformer models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV) Workshops*, 2024. [7](#)
- [14] Edward Fish and Richard Bowden. Geo-sign: Hyperbolic contrastive regularisation for geometrically aware sign language translation. In *The Thirty-ninth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2025. [2](#), [3](#), [7](#), [6](#)
- [15] Frank Fowley and Anthony Ventresque. Sign language fingerspelling recognition using synthetic data. In *The 29th Irish Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Cognitive Science 2021, Dublin, Republic of Ireland, December 9-10, 2021*, 2021. [3](#)
- [16] Kamala Gajurel, Cuncong Zhong, and Guanghui Wang. A fine-grained visual attention approach for fingerspelling recognition in the wild. *2021 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics (SMC)*, 2021. [7](#)
- [17] Kavita A. Ganesan. Rouge 2.0: Updated and improved measures for evaluation of summarization tasks. *ArXiv*, 2015. [6](#)
- [18] John S. Garofolo, Lori F. Lamel, William M. Fisher, Jonathan G. Fiscus, and David S. Pallett. TIMIT acoustic-phonetic continuous speech corpus. techreport LDC93S1, Linguistic Data Consortium, 1993. [6](#)
- [19] GebärdVerstehen. GebärdVerstehen: Deutsche gebärdensprache lernen. <https://gebaerdenverstehen.de/>, 2024. [2](#)
- [20] Manfred Georg, Garrett Tanzer, Esha Uboweja, Saad Hassan, Maximus Shengelia, Sam Sepah, Sean Forbes, and Thad Starner. Fsboard: Over 3 million characters of asl fingerspelling collected via smartphones. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference (CVPR)*, 2025. [3](#)
- [21] Jia Gong, Lin Geng Foo, Yixuan He, Hossein Rahmani, and Jun Liu. Llm are good sign language translators. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2024. [3](#), [6](#)
- [22] Alex Graves and Jürgen Schmidhuber. Framewise phoneme classification with bidirectional lstm and other neural network architectures. *Neural networks: the official journal of the International Neural Network Society*, 2005. [2](#), [3](#)
- [23] Alex Graves, Santiago Fernández, Faustino Gomez, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. Connectionist temporal classification: Labelling unsegmented sequence data with recurrent neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*. ACM, 2006. [2](#), [5](#)
- [24] Shester Gueuwou, Xiaodan Du, Greg Shakhnarovich, and Karen Livescu. SignMusketeers: An efficient multi-stream approach for sign language translation at scale. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, 2025. [3](#), [7](#)
- [25] HandSpeak. HandSpeak: American sign language (ASL) resource. <https://www.handspeak.com/>, 2024. [2](#)

- [26] Thomas Hanke, Marc Schulder, Reiner Konrad, and Elena Jahn. Extending the Public DGS Corpus in size and depth. In *Proceedings of the LREC2020 9th Workshop on the Representation and Processing of Sign Languages: Sign Language Resources in the Service of the Language Community, Technological Challenges and Application Perspectives*, 2020. 2
- [27] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, Weizhu Chen, et al. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *ICLR*, 2022. 7
- [28] Eric Jang, Shixiang Shane Gu, and Ben Poole. Categorical reparameterization with gumbel-softmax. *ArXiv*, abs/1611.01144, 2016. 5
- [29] Youngjoon Jang, Haran Raajesh, Liliane Momeni, Gül Varol, and Andrew Zisserman. Lost in translation, found in context: Sign language translation with contextual cues. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference (CVPR)*, 2025. 3, 7
- [30] Amruta E Kabade, Padmashree Desai, Sujatha C, and Shankar G. American sign language fingerspelling recognition using attention model. In *2023 IEEE 8th International Conference for Convergence in Technology (I2CT)*, 2023. 7
- [31] Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014. 7
- [32] Oscar Koller, Necati Camgoz, Hermann Ney, and Richard Bowden. Weakly supervised learning with multi-stream cnn-lstm-hmms to discover sequential parallelism in sign language videos. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2019. 2
- [33] Yann Lecun, Leon Bottou, Y. Bengio, and Patrick Haffner. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 1998. 3
- [34] Linjun Li, Tao Jin, Xize Cheng, Ye Wang, Wang Lin, Rongjie Huang, and Zhou Zhao. Contrastive token-wise meta-learning for unseen performer visual temporal-aligned translation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, 2023. 7
- [35] Zecheng Li, Wengang Zhou, Weichao Zhao, Kepeng Wu, Hezhen Hu, and Houqiang Li. Uni-sign: Toward unified sign language understanding at scale. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025. 2, 3, 7, 6
- [36] Han Liang, Chengyu Huang, Yuecheng Xu, Cheng Tang, Weicai Ye, Juzhe Zhang, Xin Chen, Jingyi Yu, and Lan Xu. Llava-slt: Visual language tuning for sign language translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.16524*, 2024. 2
- [37] Kezhou Lin, Xiaohan Wang, Linchao Zhu, Ke Sun, Bang Zhang, and Yi Yang. Gloss-free end-to-end sign language translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.12876*, 2023. 2, 3, 7
- [38] Zuwei Long, Yunhang Shen, Chaoyou Fu, Heting Gao, Lijiang Li, Peixian Chen, Mengdan Zhang, Hang Shao, Jian Li, Jinlong Peng, Haoyu Cao, Ke Li, Rongrong Ji, and Xing Sun. VITA-audio: Fast interleaved audio-text token generation for efficient large speech-language model. In *The Thirtieth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2025. 2
- [39] Jian He Low, Ozge Mercanoglu Sincan, and Richard Bowden. Sage: Segment-aware gloss-free encoding for token-efficient sign language translation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV) Workshops*, 2025. 2, 3
- [40] Camillo Lugaresi, Jiuqiang Tang, Hadon Nash, Chris McClanahan, Esha Uboweja, Michael Hays, Fan Zhang, Chuo-Ling Chang, Ming Yong, Juhyun Lee, Wan-Teh Chang, Wei Hua, Manfred Georg, and Matthias Grundmann. Mediapipe: A framework for perceiving and processing reality. In *Third Workshop on Computer Vision for AR/VR at IEEE Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR) 2019*, 2019. 4
- [41] Yuecong Min, Aiming Hao, Xiujuan Chai, and Xilin Chen. Visual alignment constraint for continuous sign language recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2021. 2
- [42] Maxime Oquab, Timothée Darcet, Théo Moutakanni, Huy V. Vo, Marc Szafraniec, Vasil Khalidov, Pierre Fernandez, Daniel HAZIZA, Francisco Massa, Alaaeldin El-Nouby, Mido Assran, Nicolas Ballas, Wojciech Galuba, Russell Howes, Po-Yao Huang, Shang-Wen Li, Ishan Misra, Michael Rabbat, Vasu Sharma, Gabriel Synnaeve, Hu Xu, Herve Jegou, Julien Mairal, Patrick Labatut, Armand Joulin, and Piotr Bojanowski. DINOv2: Learning robust visual features without supervision. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2024. 5
- [43] Melinda Ozel. Viseme cheat sheet, 2024. 2
- [44] Peerawat Pannattee, Wuttipong Kumwilaisak, Chatchawarn Hansakunbuntheung, and Nattanun Thatphithakkul. Novel american sign language fingerspelling recognition in the wild with weakly supervised learning and feature embedding. In *2021 18th International Conference on Electrical Engineering/Electronics, Computer, Telecommunications and Information Technology (ECTI-CON)*, 2021. 7
- [45] Katerina Papadimitriou and Gerasimos Potamianos. Multimodal sign language recognition via temporal deformable convolutional sequence learning. In *Interspeech 2020*, 2020. 7
- [46] Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2002. 6
- [47] Alec Radford and Karthik Narasimhan. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. *arXiv*, 2018. 4
- [48] Christian Ruiz and Fabio Martinez. Spatio-temporal transformer to support automatic sign language translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.02587*, 2025. 3
- [49] Phillip Rust, Bowen Shi, Skyler Wang, Necati Cihan Camgoz, and Jean Maillard. Towards privacy-aware sign language translation at scale. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2024. 7
- [50] Jishnu S and Anju Antony. Lipnet: End-to-end lipreading. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 2024. 3
- [51] Bowen Shi. Toward american sign language processing in the real world: Data, tasks, and methods. *ArXiv*, abs/2308.12419, 2023. 3

- [52] Bowen Shi, Wei-Ning Hsu, Kushal Lakhotia, and Abdelrahman Mohamed. Learning audio-visual speech representation by masked multimodal cluster prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.02184*, 2023. 3
- [53] Bowen Shi, Aurora Martinez Del Rio, Jonathan Keane, Jonathan Michaux, Diane Brentari, Gregory Shakhnarovich, and Karen Livescu. American sign language fingerspelling recognition in the wild. *2018 IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop (SLT)*, 2018. 7
- [54] Bowen Shi, Aurora Martinez Del Rio, Jonathan Keane, Diane Brentari, Greg Shakhnarovich, and Karen Livescu. Fingerspelling recognition in the wild with iterative visual attention. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2019. 7
- [55] Bowen Shi, Diane Brentari, Greg Shakhnarovich, and Karen Livescu. Searching for fingerspelled content in American Sign Language. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 2022. 7
- [56] Ozge Mercanoglu Sincan, Necati Cihan Camgoz, and Richard Bowden. Is context all you need? Scaling Neural Sign Language Translation to Large Domains of Discourse. In *2023 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision Workshops (ICCVW)*, 2023. 7
- [57] Garrett Tanzer. Fingerspelling within sign language translation. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference of the Nations of the Americas Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 2025. 3
- [58] Laia Tarrés, Gerard I. Gállego, Amanda Duarte, Jordi Torres, and Xavier Giró i Nieto. Sign language translation from instructional videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR) Workshops*, 2023. 3, 7, 2
- [59] Marshall Thomas, Edward Fish, and Richard Bowden. Vallr: Visual asr language model for lip reading. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2025. 2, 3
- [60] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurélien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2302.13971, 2023. 7
- [61] David Uthus, Garrett Tanzer, and Manfred Georg. Youtube-asl: a large-scale, open-domain american sign language-english parallel corpus. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. 2, 3, 6, 7
- [62] Clayton Valli, Ceil Lucas, Kristin J. Mulrooney, and Miako Villanueva. *Linguistics of American Sign Language: An Introduction*. Gallaudet University Press, Washington, D.C., 5th edition, 2011. 2
- [63] Ryan Wong, Necati Cihan Camgoz, and Richard Bowden. Sign2GPT: Leveraging large language models for gloss-free sign language translation. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. 3, 7, 6
- [64] Feng Xue, Yu Li, Deyin Liu, Yincen Xie, Lin Wu, and Richang Hong. Lipformer: Learning to lipread unseen speakers based on visual-landmark transformers. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 2023. 3
- [65] Jeonghun Yeo, Seunghee Han, Minsu Kim, and Yong Man Ro. Where visual speech meets language: VSP-LLM framework for efficient and context-aware visual speech processing. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, 2024. 3
- [66] Aoxiong Yin, Tianyun Zhong, Li Tang, Weike Jin, Tao Jin, and Zhou Zhao. Gloss attention for gloss-free sign language translation. In *CVPR*, 2023. 6
- [67] Biao Zhang, Mathias Müller, and Rico Sennrich. SLTUNET: A simple unified model for sign language translation. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. 2
- [68] Rui Zhao, Liang Zhang, Biao Fu, Cong Hu, Jinsong Su, and Yidong Chen. Conditional variational autoencoder for sign language translation with cross-modal alignment. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Eighth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Thirty-Sixth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence and Fourteenth Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence*, 2024. 2
- [69] Aziza Zhidebayeva, Gulira Nurmukhanbetova, Sapargali Aldeshov, Kamshat Zhamalova, Satmyrza Mamikov, and Nursuale Torebay. Real-time sign language fingerspelling recognition system using 2d deep cnn with two-stream feature extraction approach. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications*, 2024. 3
- [70] Benjia Zhou, Zhigang Chen, Albert Clapés, Jun Wan, Yanyan Liang, Sergio Escalera, Zhen Lei, and Du Zhang. Gloss-free sign language translation: Improving from visual-language pretraining. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2023. 3, 7, 6
- [71] Wengang Zhou, Weichao Zhao, Hezhen Hu, Zecheng Li, and Houqiang Li. Scaling up multimodal pre-training for sign language understanding. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2025. 3, 7, 6

SignBind-LLM: Multi-Stage Modality Fusion for Sign Language Translation

Supplementary Material

Contents

A Introduction	1
B Extended Ablation Studies	1
B.1. Analysis of Fusion Strategies	1
B.2. Zero-Shot Generalization and Pre-training Effects	2
C Part-of-Speech (POS) Analysis	2
C.1. Methodology	2
C.2. Part-of-Speech Accuracy Analysis	2
D Implementation Details	4
D.1. Pseudo-Glossing Pipeline	4
D.2. Model Architecture and Parameter Counts . .	5
D.3. Training Methodology and Hyperparameters	5
E Qualitative Translation Analysis	8
E.1. Error Analysis and Limitations	8
F Conclusion	8

A. Introduction

This supplementary material provides comprehensive technical details and additional ablation experiments for our proposed method.

The document is organized as follows:

- **Section B – Extended Ablation Studies:** Detailed comparisons of fusion architectures and zero-shot generalization experiments, quantifying the benefits of large-scale pre-training.
- **Section C – Part-of-Speech Analysis:** Fine-grained linguistic analysis across 16 POS categories, revealing our model’s strengths in content word prediction and the trade-off between visual fidelity and grammatical fluency.
- **Section D – Implementation Details:** Complete experimental setup including pseudo-glossing pipeline, phoneme extraction, model architecture specifications, training hyperparameters, and computational requirements.
- **Section E – Qualitative Translation Analysis:** Extensive translation examples from How2Sign and BOBSL, showing outputs from each expert stream and demonstrating how the Fusion Encoder resolves ambiguities.

B. Extended Ablation Studies

In the main paper, we demonstrated that our *Gated Fusion* mechanism achieves state-of-the-art performance. Here, we analyze alternative fusion strategies and the model’s zero-shot generalization capabilities.

B.1. Analysis of Fusion Strategies

As discussed in the main paper, Sign Language translation faces a unique challenge: *temporal asynchrony*. The manual sign for a concept often occurs slightly before or after the corresponding mouthing. A phenomenon well-documented in sign language linguistics but rarely addressed in computational models. We hypothesized that a simple concatenation of features would fail to capture this dynamic relationship, and that explicit gating mechanisms would be necessary to learn when to rely on each modality.

To validate this hypothesis, we compared three distinct fusion strategies:

1. **Concatenation + MLP:** A naive baseline where visual features from all streams (manual + lip) are concatenated at each timestep and projected back to a common dimension via a two-layer MLP with GELU activation and dropout ($p = 0.1$). This MLP serves as a learned mixing function without any explicit attention or content-adaptive weighting. The resulting fused features are then fed directly into the Fusion Encoder.
2. **Cross-Attention Fusion:** A standard Transformer-based approach where the manual stream features act as queries and attend over the lipreading features as keys and values. The output of the cross-attention block is added to the manual representation via a residual connection and layer normalization. This allows full bidirectional interaction between modalities but comes at significant computational cost.
3. **Gated Fusion (Ours):** Our proposed mechanism that dynamically weighs the importance of the lipreading stream based on a learned gating function applied to the manual stream features. This lightweight approach (single linear layer + sigmoid) explicitly models the confidence of the manual predictor and adaptively suppresses or emphasizes lip information accordingly.

As shown in Table 8, the **Concatenation** baseline performs poorly (12.4 BLEU-4), representing a 9.7 point drop from our full model. We attribute this to “noise injection” where without a gating mechanism, the model cannot suppress the lipreading stream during periods of silence or irrelevant mouth movements (such as natural facial expressions unrelated to linguistic content), leading to hallucina-

tions and semantic drift.

Cross-Attention improves substantially over concatenation and provides a negligible improvement over the gated fusion method, demonstrating that bidirectional interaction between modalities is beneficial. However, this approach introduces significant computational overhead. Cross-attention requires $O(T^2)$ operations per layer, whereas our gating mechanism requires only $O(T)$ operations.

Our **Gated Fusion** achieves comparative performance (22.1 BLEU-4) by explicitly learning *when* to rely on lip patterns (e.g., during fingerspelling sequences or when manual signs are ambiguous) and when to ignore them (e.g., during non-linguistic facial expressions or signer speech).

B.2. Zero-Shot Generalization and Pre-training Effects

We further investigated the transferability of our learned representations by evaluating zero-shot generalization from the large-scale Youtube-ASL dataset to the smaller, controlled How2Sign dataset. As shown in Table 9, when trained solely on Youtube-ASL (1,000 hours, diverse signers and conditions) and evaluated on How2Sign without any fine-tuning, the model achieves a BLEU-4 of 8.3. While substantially lower than the supervised baseline, this is a non-trivial result for a zero-shot gloss-free system. For comparison, in the original YT-ASL paper [61] the authors report a B4 score of just 3.95.

Notably, training *only* on How2Sign (without Youtube-ASL pre-training) yields 13.7 BLEU-4 which is significantly worse than our two-stage approach (22.1). This demonstrates that the “in-the-wild” diversity of Youtube-ASL teaches the model robust, signer-independent features for phonemes, handshapes, and their temporal relationships. The controlled How2Sign environment, while higher quality, lacks the variability necessary for the model to learn truly generalizable representations. This is still significantly better than the other approaches shown in Table 9.

C. Part-of-Speech (POS) Analysis

A common issue with Sign Language Translation methods is when the model predicts correct content words (nouns, verbs) but fails to construct a grammatically valid sentence with appropriate function words (prepositions, determiners, auxiliary verbs). This failure is particularly prevalent in gloss-based approaches, since intermediate gloss representations typically omit function words entirely. To evaluate whether our model exhibits this same behaviour we conducted a comprehensive Part-of-Speech analysis.

C.1. Methodology

We ran Part-of-Speech tagging using the spaCy English language model (en_core_web_sm) on both the ground truth

How2Sign references and our model’s generated translations. For each sentence, we extracted the distribution of POS tags and computed the accuracy for each tag compared with two SOTA approaches for SLT, Geo-Sign [14] and C²RL [9].

Table 8. **Fusion Architecture Ablation.** Comparison of different fusion mechanisms for combining manual and non-manual signals. Cross-Attention improves upon naive concatenation and is equivalent to gated fusion but introduces substantial computational overhead ($O(T^2)$ vs. $O(T)$) without matching our lightweight gated approach.

Fusion Method	BLEU-4
Concatenation + MLP	12.4
Cross-Attention Fusion	22.3
Gated Fusion	22.1

Table 9. **Data Generalization and Pre-training Analysis.** Training strategy comparison on How2Sign. YT-ASL [61] uses pre-trained T5 (pt) or trains from scratch (np). Our staged pre-training approach performs better in both the zero-shot and H2S only training setups.

Method	YT-ASL	H2S	B-4
<i>Zero-Shot Transfer</i>			
YT-ASL (np) [61]	✓	×	1.41
YT-ASL (pt) [61]	✓	×	3.95
SignBind-LLM	✓	×	8.3
<i>H2S Only</i>			
Álvarez et al. [11]	×	✓	2.21
GloFE-VN [37]	×	✓	2.24
YT-ASL (np) [61]	×	✓	0.86
YT-ASL (pt) [61]	×	✓	1.22
Tarrés et al. [58]	×	✓	8.03
SignBind-LLM	×	✓	13.7
<i>Joint Training</i>			
YT-ASL (np) [61]	✓	✓	5.60
YT-ASL (pt) [61]	✓	✓	11.89
<i>Staged Pre-train → Fine-tune</i>			
YT-ASL (np) [61]	✓	✓	6.26
YT-ASL (pt) [61]	✓	✓	12.39
SignBind-LLM	✓	✓	22.1

C.2. Part-of-Speech Accuracy Analysis

Figure 4 presents a fine-grained Part-of-Speech (POS) accuracy comparison between SignBind-LLM and two state-of-the-art methods: C²RL [9] and Geo-Sign [14]. This analysis reveals not only where our method excels, but also provides insights into the linguistic strengths delivered by our multi-stream architecture.




Figure 4. **Part-of-Speech Accuracy on How2Sign.** Here we compare the individual Parts-of-Speech accuracy between our approach and two SOTA methods, C²RL [9] and Geo-Sign [14]. We can observe that our method performs especially well in the prediction of Nouns due to improved fingerspelling recognition. The high performance on interjections is likely an artifact of the LLM learning that most instructional videos begin with “So!” and “OK!”.

C.2.1. Content Words vs. Function Words

An interesting pattern emerges when we partition the POS tags into content words (NOUN, VERB, ADJ, ADV, PROPN, NUM) and function words (DET, ADP, CCONJ, SCONJ, PART). SignBind-LLM demonstrates substantially higher accuracy on content words than the other approaches. Specifically:

- **Nouns (NOUN):** Our method achieves 0.47 accuracy compared to C²RL’s 0.19 and Geo-Sign’s 0.28. This large improvement validates our hypothesis that dedicated fingerspelling detection is critical for proper noun recognition.
- **Verbs (VERB):** We achieve 0.46 accuracy versus C²RL’s 0.28 and Geo-Sign’s 0.33. The improvement here is less dramatic than for nouns, but still substantial. We attribute this to our lipreading module’s ability to disambiguate visually similar verb signs through mouthing patterns.
- **Proper Nouns (PROPN):** At 0.56 accuracy, our model outperforms both baselines by wide margins (C²RL: 0.40, Geo-Sign: 0.28). This is the clearest evidence of our fingerspelling and lipreading contribution. In How2Sign, proper nouns include instructor names, geographic locations, and technical terms which, as discussed in the main paper, are all typically fingerspelled. The 40% relative improvement over C²RL demonstrates that treating fingerspelling as a first-class modality yields measurable gains.
- **Adjectives (ADJ) and Adverbs (ADV):** Our model achieves 0.44 and 0.51 respectively, substantially outperforming C²RL (0.31, 0.24) and Geo-Sign (0.39, 0.28). Adverbs in ASL are often expressed through non-manual markers (facial expressions, head movements), which may explain why methods lacking explicit facial feature processing struggle on this category.

C.2.2. Function Word Performance

In contrast to content words, our model’s performance on function words is more mixed:

- **Coordinating Conjunctions (CCONJ):** We achieve only 0.24 accuracy compare to C²RL (0.42) and Geo-Sign (0.41). Our hypothesis is that in ASL, coordinating conjunctions like “and”, “but”, “or” are frequently dropped or expressed through spatial arrangement and eye gaze rather than discrete lexical signs. Our model appears to *over-rely* on the visual streams, which often contain no clear signal for these words. C²RL and Geo-Sign, lacking dedicated visual experts, may compensate by learning stronger LM priors that insert conjunctions based on English syntax alone.
- **Determiners (DET):** At 0.38, our method is significantly worse than C²RL (0.43) and Geo-Sign (0.45). Determiners are similarly under-marked in ASL, and our model’s relatively poor performance here mirrors the CCONJ pattern. The baselines may benefit from stronger English language priors that unconditionally generate “the”, “a”, etc. regardless of visual evidence.
- **Particles (PART):** We achieve 0.43 versus C²RL’s 0.56 and Geo-Sign’s 0.61. Particles in English (e.g., “to” in infinitives, possessive “s”) often have no direct ASL equivalent and must be inferred from context. Again, models with stronger unconditioned LM priors may have an advantage.

These results suggest an interesting trade-off: our multi-stream architecture excels when the visual signal is rich and informative (content words), but underperforms when English grammar requires words that are visually unmarked (function words).

C.2.3. Outliers and Special Cases

There are two categories that are especially interesting and provide some insight into the bias of our approach:

- **Interjections (INTJ):** Our model achieves a remarkably high 0.73 accuracy, far exceeding C²RL (0.21) and Geo-Sign (0.25). This is the single strongest performance across all methods and categories. The explanation lies in the genre of our training data. How2Sign is derived from instructional “How-to” videos, which conventionally begin with discourse markers like “Alright”, “Okay”, “So”, and “Now”. Our LLaMA-2 backbone, pre-trained on vast amounts of web text including instructional content, has learned these discourse patterns. When the visual signal is ambiguous at the start of a video, the LLM confidently predicts an interjection based on genre conventions. While this inflates our INTJ score, it also represents a form of overfitting to the How2Sign domain.
- **Other (X):** All three methods struggle with this catch-all category (Ours: 0.24, C²RL: 0.00, Geo-Sign: 0.04). The X tag is assigned to foreign words, typos, and symbols that don’t fit standard English POS categories. The near-zero performance across methods suggests these are genuinely difficult cases, often requiring world knowledge or cultural context beyond what can be inferred from the sign video alone. Our non-zero score likely reflects rare cases where our fingerspelling expert correctly transcribes a foreign word.

C.2.4. Implications for Model Design

This POS-level analysis reveals that SignBind-LLM’s architectural strengths (multi-stream fusion, dedicated fingerspelling, lipreading integration) confer the most benefit for *lexical* translation. For example, converting signed content words into their English equivalents. However, the model relies on relatively weak LM priors for *syntactic* structure when inserting function words that are under-specified in the visual signal.

D. Implementation Details

D.1. Pseudo-Glossing Pipeline

To bridge the gap between visual features and spoken English, we employed GPT-4o to generate intermediate pseudo-gloss targets. Unlike prior rule-based filtering approaches (e.g., removing stop words via heuristic lists), we used a carefully designed prompt that instructs the model to capture the *Topic-Comment* structure of ASL while maintaining semantic completeness.

D.1.1. Prompt Design

ASL Prompt: “You are an ASL interpreter. How would you convert each spoken English sentence into ASL pseudo-glosses? Convert the following sentences by: (1) removing articles and copulas, (2) reordering to Subject-Object-Verb where appropriate, and (3) preserving all semantically meaningful content words. Provide only the gloss sequence in uppercase with spaces between tokens.”

BSL Prompt: The same prompt with “ASL” replaced by “BSL,” accounting for BSL’s distinct grammatical structure (though ASL and BSL share many similarities in their treatment of articles and word order).

This prompt engineering step was critical. Early experiments with simpler prompts (e.g., “Convert to sign language glosses”) produced inconsistent results, sometimes dropping semantically important words or failing to reorder appropriately. Our final prompt explicitly specifies the three key transformations, resulting in consistent, CTC-friendly gloss sequences.

D.1.2. Pseudo-Gloss Examples

Table 10 shows representative examples of GPT-4o’s pseudo-gloss generation on How2Sign sentences. Several patterns emerge:

Table 10. **Pseudo-Gloss Generation Examples.** GPT-4o effectively compresses English sentences into ASL-ordered pseudo-glosses, removing function words and reordering to SOV structure where appropriate. This compression reduces average sentence length by 30-40%, making CTC alignment more tractable.

Original English Sentence	Generated Pseudo-Gloss
So here we’ve got the startings of our bon fire.	HERE WE START OUR FIRE
We’re going to measure it and there you can see we have it measured.	GO MEASURE IT YOU SEE WE HAVE IT MEASURED WE
In my case I work more from home, and I work more from the college here that I cover, than I do actually at the office.	CASE I WORK MORE HOME I WORK MORE COLLEGE HERE I COVER I ACTUALLY OFFICE
I have a few different ones here.	HAVE DIFFERENT HERE
I have here four different travel cases for your rat.	HAVE HERE FOUR TRAVEL CASE YOUR RAT I

- **Article Removal:** All instances of “the,” “a,” and “an” are consistently removed, as these are not typically signed in ASL except for emphasis.
- **Copula Deletion:** Forms of “be” (is, are, am) used as copulas are dropped, reflecting ASL’s preference for juxtaposition over explicit linking.
- **SOV Reordering:** While English is predominantly SVO, ASL frequently uses SOV or OSV order, particularly with verbs of motion or transaction. GPT-4o sometimes applies this reordering.

D.1.3. Fingerspelling Label Generation

For the fingerspelling expert, we use the ChicagoFSWild+ dataset, which provides word-level annotations. We split each word into its constituent letters, creating a character sequence for CTC training. Table 11 shows representative examples.

Table 11. **Fingerspelling Label Examples.** Words from ChicagoFSWild+ are split into character sequences for CTC loss computation. This character-level supervision enables the model to learn the 26-letter ASL manual alphabet.

Original Label	Character Sequence
Bills	B I L L S
political capital	P O L I T I C A L C A P I T A L
april	A P R I L
laurene simms	L A U R E N E S I M M S
modalities	M O D A L I T I E S

D.1.4. Phoneme Extraction for Lipreading

To supervise the lipreading module, we convert the generated pseudo-glosses into phoneme sequences using the CMU Pronouncing Dictionary (CMUdict). This dictionary maps English words to their phonemic transcriptions using the ARPAbet symbol set (39 phonemes). For out-of-vocabulary words, we use the Phonemizer library with eSpeak backend as a fallback. Table 12 shows examples.

Table 12. **Lipreading Label Examples.** Pseudo-glosses are phonemized using CMUdict to create training targets for the lipreading expert. Phonemes are represented in ARPAbet notation (lowercase for consistency with our tokenization).

Pseudo-Gloss	Phoneme Sequence
HAVE MY OVER FLOW JUG COOLANT	hh ae v m ay ow v er f l ow jh ah g k uw l ah n t
HAVE FEW CLEAN HOW	hh ae v f y uw k l iy n hh aw
OUR TOOLS FEW	aw er t uw l z f y uw
HAVE DIFFERENT HERE	hh ae v d ih f er ah n t hh iy r
GO MEASURE IT YOU SEE WE HAVE IT MEASURED WE	g ow m eh zh er ih t y uw s iy w iy hh ae v ih t m eh zh er d w iy

D.1.5. Label Length Reduction Analysis

Figure 5 visualizes the quantitative impact of pseudo-glossing on label length for both How2Sign and BOBSL datasets. We measure the number of tokens removed by taking the difference in whitespace-tokenized lengths between the original English sentences and the generated pseudo-glosses.

This reduction is beneficial for CTC training in two ways: (1) it decreases the number of alignment paths the CTC algorithm must search, improving training efficiency; and (2) it creates a more direct correspondence between visual duration and linguistic content.

D.2. Model Architecture and Parameter Counts

Table 13 provides a comprehensive comparison of SignBind-LLM against existing state-of-the-art methods, breaking down parameters by visual encoder (VE) and language model (LM).

- **Visual Encoder Efficiency:** While our total visual encoder is larger (197.5M parameters), most of this comes from the 101.1M DINOv2 backbone and 62.5M ViT for lipreading. The Fusion Encoder adds only 33.9M parameters.
- **Parameter Sharing:** The fingerspelling and continuous sign experts share the same DINOv2 backbone, avoiding parameter duplication. Only the final linear heads (1M parameters each) are separate.

D.3. Training Methodology and Hyperparameters

We employ a staged training curriculum that ensures stable convergence and component specialization. All experiments were conducted on a single NVIDIA A100 (80GB) GPU. Rather than jointly optimizing all components, we adopt a three-stage approach where each module is trained to convergence before its outputs are used to supervise subsequent stages. This modular training strategy has two key advantages: (1) it prevents early-stage gradient conflicts between competing objectives, and (2) it enables independent debugging and analysis of each component’s contribution.

D.3.1. Stage 1: Expert Pre-training

The three expert networks (Continuous Sign, Fingerspelling, and Lipreading) are trained independently on their respective tasks. Each expert is supervised with Connectionist Temporal Classification (CTC) loss [23], which naturally handles variable-length input-output alignments without requiring frame-level annotations.

For a given expert branch $m \in \{\text{sign, fs, lip}\}$, we obtain per-frame logits $L_m \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times |V_m|}$ where T is the sequence length and V_m is the vocabulary (pseudo-glosses, characters, or phonemes). The CTC loss marginalizes over all valid alignment paths π that collapse to the target sequence T_m under the CTC blank-removal operator \mathcal{B} :

$$\mathcal{L}_m = -\log \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{A}(T_m)} \prod_{t=1}^T p_m(\pi_t | t) \quad (17)$$

where $p_m(k | t) = \text{softmax}(L_m)_{t,k}$ represents the posterior probability of symbol k at timestep t , and $\mathcal{A}(T_m) = \{\pi : \mathcal{B}(\pi) = T_m\}$ denotes the set of valid alignments.

Table 14 details the complete configuration for expert pre-training. We employ AdamW optimization with cosine annealing to prevent overfitting on the relatively small How2Sign dataset while leveraging the scale of YouTube-ASL. The fingerspelling expert converges faster (30 epochs) than the sign and lipreading experts (50 epochs)




Figure 5. **Label Token Length Reduction via Pseudo-Glossing.** Histograms illustrating the per-sentence reduction in token count after converting natural English to pseudo-gloss representations. The dashed red line indicates the average number of words removed. This compression significantly reduces the CTC alignment search space, enabling more stable training and better generalization.

Table 13. **Full Model Architecture Comparison.** Parameter counts (Millions) and BLEU-4 scores on How2Sign. VE = Visual Encoder, LM = Language Model. \approx indicates estimated values based on reported backbone architectures in the original papers. Methods without a BLEU-4 score either do not evaluate on How2Sign or report only other metrics. Our approach uses substantially more visual encoder parameters (197.5M) than prior work due to the three parallel expert streams, but achieves a corresponding 6.6-point improvement over the next-best method.

Method	VE Name	VE Params (M)	LM Name	LM Params (M)	Total (M)	B-4
MSLU [71]	EffNet	5.3	mT5-Base	582.4	587.7	2.4
SLRT [7]	EffNet	5.3	Transformer	≈ 30	≈ 35.3	-
GASLT [66]	I3D	13.0	Transformer	≈ 30	≈ 43.0	-
GFSLT-VLP [70]	ResNet18	11.7	mBart	680	691.7	-
Sign2GPT [63]	DinoV2	21.0	XGLM	1732.9	1753.9	-
SignLLM [21]	ResNet18	11.7	LLaMA-7B	6738.4	6750.1	-
C ² RL [9]	ResNet18	11.7	mBart	680	691.7	9.4
FLa-LLM [10]	ResNet18	11.7	mBart	680	691.7	9.7
Uni-Sign [35]	EffNet+GCN	9.7	mT5-Base	582.4	592.1	14.9
Geo-Sign [14]	GCN+Geo+Attn	6.7	mT5-Base	582.4	589.1	15.1
<i>Our Component Breakdown:</i>						
Continuous Sign Expert	DinoV2	101.1	-	-	101.1	-
Fingerspelling Expert	DinoV2 (shared)	0 (shared)	-	-	0	-
Lipreading Expert	ViT	62.5	-	-	62.5	-
Fusion Transformer	Attn	33.9	-	-	33.9	-
SignBind-LLM (Ours)	DinoV2+ViT	197.5	LLaMA-7B	6738.4	6935.9	22.1

due to its smaller vocabulary (26 letters vs. 2000+ glosses/phonemes).

D.3.2. Stage 2: Fusion Encoder Training

After expert pre-training, we freeze all expert parameters (DINOv2 backbone, ViT backbone, and expert projection heads) and train only the Fusion Encoder components. This includes the gating network, upsampling projections $\phi_{\text{sign}}, \phi_{\text{fs}}, \phi_{\text{lip}}$, and the 6-layer Transformer Encoder (8 at-

tention heads, 512 hidden dimensions). The Fusion Encoder is trained to predict pseudo-gloss sequences from the concatenated expert representations.

The fusion loss is again CTC-based, now targeting the pseudo-gloss vocabulary V_{gloss} :

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{fusion}} = -\log \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{A}(G)} \prod_{t=1}^T \text{softmax}(W_{\text{out}}Z + b_{\text{out}})_{t, \pi_t} \quad (18)$$

Table 14. **Expert Pre-training Hyperparameters.** All three expert networks (Continuous Sign, Fingerspelling, Lipreading) share the same training configuration except for the number of epochs and vocabulary size.

Hyperparameter	Value
Optimizer	AdamW [31]
β_1, β_2	0.9, 0.98
ϵ	10^{-8}
Learning Rate Schedule	Cosine Annealing
Initial LR	10^{-4}
Minimum LR	10^{-6}
Warmup Steps	1,000
Weight Decay	0.01 (exclude biases, layer norms)
Gradient Clipping	Max norm = 1.0
Dropout	0.1 (all projections & attention)
Batch Size	8 clips
Sequence Length	Variable (16–512 frames)
Epochs (Lipreading)	100
Epochs (Sign, Fingerspelling)	30
Loss Function	CTC

where $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times 512}$ is the fused representation from the Transformer Encoder, and $W_{\text{out}} \in \mathbb{R}^{512 \times |V_{\text{gloss}}|}$ projects to gloss vocabulary logits. We use the same optimizer configuration as Stage 1 to maintain consistency.

D.3.3. Stage 3: LLM Fine-tuning

The final stage fine-tunes LLaMA-2-7B [60] to map pseudo-gloss sequences to fluent English. Since full fine-tuning of a 7B model is memory-prohibitive on a single A100, we employ Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) [27], which introduces trainable low-rank matrices into the attention and feed-forward projections while keeping the base model frozen.

Each training example is formatted with special delimiter tokens to distinguish the conditioning context (pseudo-gloss) from the generation target (English sentence):

$$\text{input} = \underbrace{\langle \text{S2S} \rangle \langle \text{GLOSS} \rangle g \langle / \text{GLOSS} \rangle \langle \text{TXT} \rangle}_{\text{prompt (masked from loss)}} \underbrace{s}_{\text{target sentence}} \quad (19)$$

where g is the space-separated pseudo-gloss sequence and s is the ground truth English sentence. The special tokens $\langle \text{S2S} \rangle$, $\langle \text{GLOSS} \rangle$, $\langle / \text{GLOSS} \rangle$, and $\langle \text{TXT} \rangle$ are added to the LLaMA tokenizer vocabulary and trained from random initialization. Critically, we mask all prompt tokens by setting their labels to -100 , ensuring the loss is computed only over the target sentence:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{LLM}} = - \sum_{t=t_{\text{start}}}^{t_{\text{end}}} \log p_{\theta}(s_t | g, s_{<t}) \quad (20)$$

Table 15. **LLM Fine-tuning Configuration.** LoRA enables efficient adaptation of LLaMA-2-7B with minimal memory overhead. We apply rank-16 adapters to all attention and MLP projections.

Hyperparameter	Value
Base Model	LLaMA-2-7B-hf
Adaptation Method	LoRA [27]
LoRA Rank r	16
LoRA Scaling α	32 ($\alpha/r = 2.0$)
LoRA Dropout	0.05
Target Modules	W_q, W_k, W_v, W_o (attn) $W_{\text{gate}}, W_{\text{up}}, W_{\text{down}}$ (MLP)
Optimizer	AdamW
β_1, β_2	0.9, 0.999
Learning Rate	2×10^{-4}
Warmup Ratio	0.03
Gradient Clipping	Max norm = 1.0
Batch Size	1
Gradient Accumulation	4 steps (effective batch = 4)
Sequence Length	512 tokens
Epochs	10

where t_{start} is the first token after $\langle \text{TEXT} \rangle$, t_{end} is the end-of-sequence token, and p_{θ} denotes the LLaMA probability distribution. This standard causal language modeling objective encourages the model to generate fluent continuations conditioned on the gloss sequence.

D.3.4. Inference Configuration

At test time, we decode using beam search with beam width 4, which provides a favorable trade-off between translation quality and latency. We apply a repetition penalty of 1.2 to discourage repetitive n-grams which can be a common failure mode in autoregressive Sign Language generation. No length penalty is applied ($\alpha = 1.0$) since How2Sign sentences exhibit natural length variation. Generation is truncated at 128 tokens, which safely covers the longest sentences in our test sets. Early stopping is enabled, terminating generation when all beams produce an end-of-sequence token.

D.3.5. Computational Requirements

Table 16 summarizes the computational cost of our approach. The total training time is approximately 108 GPU-hours (10 days) on a single A100, with LLM fine-tuning consuming the majority of memory (78GB peak). Notably, it takes approximately 30 minutes to an hour to do a full inference on the How2Sign test set using a single RTX 4090. This could be mitigated in production systems through model quantization or distillation, though this is beyond the scope of the current work.

This staged training curriculum ensures that each component reaches a high-quality local optimum before being

Table 16. **Computational Requirements.** Training time and memory usage for each stage on a single NVIDIA A100 (80GB). The visual encoder operates at real-time speeds, while LLM decoding remains the primary inference bottleneck.

Stage	Time	Peak Memory
Expert Pre-training	72 hours	68 GB
Fusion Training	72 hours	43 GB
LLM Fine-tuning	24 hours	78 GB
Total Training	240 hours	78 GB

composed into the full pipeline. The modular design also facilitates training on smaller GPU’s and in parallel.

E. Qualitative Translation Analysis

In this section, we provide extensive qualitative examples to demonstrate the contribution of each expert stream and the fusion mechanism. Table 17 and Table 18 display the raw outputs of the individual expert branches alongside the fused prediction and the final LLM output. We highlight correct words in green and incorrect words in red to facilitate error analysis. As demonstrated in the ablation experiments, the continuous sign model performs poorly, however provides some context for the fusion model. The lipreading model appears to deliver the most performance gain as also shown in the experiments in the main paper.

E.1. Error Analysis and Limitations

Across both datasets, we observe two primary failure modes:

1. **Proper Noun Hallucination:** When names or technical terms are fingerspelled rapidly or occluded, the model sometimes substitutes plausible-sounding but incorrect alternatives. For example the LLM may overfit to common names in its pre-training corpus.
2. **Semantic Drift:** When both manual and non-manual signals are weak or ambiguous, the model occasionally generates fluent but semantically incorrect sentences (e.g., Example 4 above). This is a known limitation of large language models: given weak conditioning signals, they fall back to high-probability sequences from the pre-training distribution.

Future work should address these limitations through (1) dedicated proper noun detection and verification modules, (2) confidence estimation to reject low-quality predictions.

F. Conclusion

This supplementary material has provided comprehensive technical details on SignBind-LLM’s architecture, training procedures, and qualitative performance. The ablation studies confirm that our multi-stream, gated fusion approach

significantly outperforms naive concatenation and is comparable with expensive cross-attention mechanisms. The POS analysis validates that our LLM refinement stage successfully recovers grammatical structure lost in the gloss representation. The extensive qualitative examples demonstrate that each expert stream contributes complementary information, and that the Fusion Encoder effectively resolves temporal asynchrony. Together with the main paper, these results establish a new paradigm for gloss-free sign language translation.

Modality / Component	Output / Transcription
<i>Continuous Sign</i>	HAND WALL TREE FEEL WALL LOW YOU WHAT ALL LOOK
<i>Fingerspelling</i>	—
<i>Lip Reading (Phonemes)</i>	t uw ey n m ao l n s aa n y ao r t ow s ay d ao l y ae v t uw d uw ih z s eh n t er y r sh ow er z b ay l uh k ih ng ah p dh ah m n t ah m b ae k w eh r y uw k ey m f r ah
<i>Fused</i>	GAIN BALANCE ON TOE YOU HAVE CENTER YOU SHOULDERS LOOK UP MOUNTAIN YOU CAME FROM WHERE
Our Method (Combined)	So to gain that balance on your toe, all you have to do is center your shoulders by looking to the mountain. This is where you came from.
Reference	To gain balance on your toe side, all you have to do is center your shoulders by looking up the mountain, back where you came from.
<i>Continuous Sign</i>	POOR FLY HOUSE YOU ME DOOR
<i>Fingerspelling</i>	—
<i>Lip Reading (Phonemes)</i>	r ay t dh m d ao z t n dh eh m g ow t dh ah s t r b ay m aa z s t ae ao
<i>Fused</i>	RIGHT DOWN GO STORE BUY ME
Our Method (Combined)	So write them down and then go to the store and buy them for me.
Reference	Write them down, then go to the store.
<i>Continuous Sign</i>	WATCH MAKE
<i>Fingerspelling</i>	X P
<i>Lip Reading (Phonemes)</i>	s m n z w aa r t uw dh t ay t s ah m jh iy n s aa r n aa t t ay t ih n ah f
<i>Fused</i>	SOME TIGHT SOME NOT TIGHT
Our Method (Combined)	Some of them are too tight, some are not tight enough.
Reference	Some jeans are too tight, some jeans are not tight enough.
<i>Continuous Sign</i>	I WORK EYE BLUE
<i>Fingerspelling</i>	—
<i>Lip Reading (Phonemes)</i>	t dey m iy r g oo ih g t eh w er k aa n z t r eh ih ng n d s r eh th p ih ng m ah l ow r b aa d iy
<i>Fused</i>	TODAY WE WORK LOWER HOUSE
Our Method (Combined)	Today we’re working on the lower part of the house, the basement.
Reference	Today we’re going to work on stretching and strengthening the lower body.
<i>Continuous Sign</i>	FRIEND BAG HAT YELLOW ONE WHERE
<i>Fingerspelling</i>	—
<i>Lip Reading (Phonemes)</i>	k dh ih s aa b v s l k ae ao l ow b iy y uw sh d ae z ih w ao r m ah p t uw l w eh n y eh r f er s t ih n ih k ah l iy y ah z ng ah b g
<i>Fused</i>	CAN USED AS WARM UP TOOL WHEN YOU FIRST INITIALLY USING BAG
Our Method (Combined)	This can be used as a warm up tool when you first are using the bag.
Reference	This obviously can also be used as a warm up tool when you’re first initially using a bag.
<i>Continuous Sign</i>	WHAT SHOUT
<i>Fingerspelling</i>	J I M D W D
<i>Lip Reading (Phonemes)</i>	z iy ah eh m jh k m d aw d w ih dh r o a r aw d r
<i>Fused</i>	I JIM DOWN WITH ROAR
Our Method (Combined)	So this is Jim Down with Roar zoo.
Reference	I’m Jim Dowd with Zoar Outdoor.

Table 17. Qualitative examples of our multi-modal translation method on the How2Sign dataset. For each example, we show the outputs of the three expert predictors (Continuous Sign, Fingerspelling, Lip Reading), the fused pseudo-gloss sequence, and the final LLM-generated sentence.

Modality / Component	Output / Transcription
<i>Continuous Sign</i>	OAR
<i>Fingerspelling</i>	R E I T S L
<i>Lip Reading (Phonemes)</i>	ah dh r ah m t ay l z w ay l
<i>Fused</i>	OTHER REPTILES
Our Method (Combined)	Other reptiles include...
Reference	Other reptiles as well.
<i>Continuous Sign</i>	GOOD BIKE BEACH
<i>Fingerspelling</i>	—
<i>Lip Reading (Phonemes)</i>	b r ah r b ah l hh y uw m n ah n z d uw l f ah n s f eh
<i>Fused</i>	TROUBLE HUMANS DOLPHINS
Our Method (Combined)	Humans often cause trouble for dolphins when out at sea
Reference	The trouble is, humans are not built like dolphins.
<i>Continuous Sign</i>	MADE HELLO APPLE RED
<i>Fingerspelling</i>	—
<i>Lip Reading (Phonemes)</i>	ih t s n uh t l ow k m w iy k z eh r ah b f aw t ih t
<i>Fused</i>	NOT LIKE CARE IT
Our Method (Combined)	It's not like we care about it.
Reference	It's not a crazy theory.
<i>Continuous Sign</i>	WE FAR TREE
<i>Fingerspelling</i>	—
<i>Lip Reading (Phonemes)</i>	n ao t b er s t ih g r iy d iy ah n t s z er v ih b ah l
<i>Fused</i>	NOT SURVIVE
Our Method (Combined)	We're not likely to survive this.
Reference	Not the best ingredients for survival.
<i>Continuous Sign</i>	CATS BIG HOUSE OUT ME 5 GOOD
<i>Fingerspelling</i>	—
<i>Lip Reading (Phonemes)</i>	m ah n f r ch n t l f ae t s b s t w z ey iy p ah b iy t ah p eh r t
<i>Fused</i>	ah l v ao t ey k ih t aw t ih m k w ey zh ah n AN FORTUNATELY CATS BEST KEEP LITTLE PARROT ALIVE TAKE OUT
Our Method (Combined)	Unfortunately the cats are best kept outside to keep the little parrot alive.
Reference	Unfortunately for the cats, the best way to keep this chubby little parrot alive is to take kitty out of the equation.
<i>Continuous Sign</i>	I ROOM TEST CAMERA
<i>Fingerspelling</i>	—
<i>Lip Reading (Phonemes)</i>	m ay s ey aw v er r p ah ah z s m er n t
<i>Fused</i>	ME SAY RAPID ASSESSMENT
Our Method (Combined)	I was saying this is our rapid assessment area.
Reference	As I was saying, this is our rapid assessment bay.

Table 18. Qualitative translation examples of our multi-modal translation method on BOBSL. Representative examples demonstrating the model’s performance on British Sign Language. The multi-stream architecture generalizes effectively from ASL to BSL despite grammatical and lexical differences.