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## Motivation

- Interactive streaming of sound is getting more and more popular.
- For example, Zoom, Google Meet, and TEAMS are often used for online teaching.
- State-of-the-art speech/audio coders: BV32, MPEG, AAC-ELD, MPEG-USAC, 3GPP EVS, Opus.
- Interactive music rehearsal or performances require high quality and extremely low latency.
- Even for one way end-2-end delays $>5 \mathrm{~ms}$, som music is hard to play.
- A good solution is JackTrip from CCRMA Stanford (no data compression and no efficient solutions towards packet losses)


## Motivation and key challenges for music over networks

- Many wireless channels suffer from packet losses - e.g., 5\% losses.
- Even wired communications over the internet suffers from jitter, especially when driving the communications near the minimal possible practical latency.
- In music performances both lost and late packets are "lost".
- Re-transmissions add latency - and require a feedback channel.
- The playback rate needs to be stable (nearly constant).
- To ensure this, a jitter (playback) buffer is used, which stores a number of packets before being played out.
- The delay is therefore proportional to the number of packets stored in the buffer.
- Packet-loss concealment methods are mainly helpful when interpolating between short gaps and not extrapolating into the future.

Key challenges addressed in this work:

1. very low delay high-quality audio coding
2. robustness to packet losses and packet jitter without introducing further delay

## Multiple description audio coding

- There are many ways to construct multiple descriptions but less work has applied it to audio coding: (this list is not exhaustive)
- Multiple description perceptual audio coding with correlating transform. Kovacevic, V.K. Goyal. IEEE Trans. Speech and Audio Processing, 2000.
- Robust low-delay audio coding using multiple descriptions. G. Schuller, J. Kovacevic, F. Masson, V.K. Goyal. IEEE Trans. Speech and Audio Processing, 2005.
- Perceptual audio coding using n-channel lattice vector quantization. J. Østergaard, O. Niamut, J. Jensen, R. Heusdens. IEEE ICASSP 2006.
- Multiple description coding for an mp3 coded sound signal. H. Wey, A. Ito, T. Okamoto, Y. Suzuki. ICA 2010.
- Real-time perceptual moving-horizon multiple-description audio coding. J. Østergaard, D.E. Quevedo, J. Jensen. IEEE Trans. Signal Processing. 2011.
- Practical design of delta-sigma multiple-description audio coding.
J. Leegaard, J. Østergaard, S.H. Jensen, R. Zamir. EURASIP Journal on audio, speech, and music. 2014.


## Delta sigma quantization

- In delta-sigma quantization, the source is oversampled

- Consider a white Gaussian source
- Upsample by a factor of 2
- The resulting spectrum covers half the frequency band

(a) Spectrum of $X$


Multiple-Description Coding by Dithered Delta Sigma Quantization. J. Østergaard, R. Zamir, IEEE Data Compression Conference, 2007.
(c) Spectrum of $A$

## Delta sigma quantization

- After upsampling, closed-loop quantization takes place

- The quantization noise covers the full spectrum and is white before being shaped.
- The quantization noise is shaped by a noise-shaping filter, which reduces the energy of the inband noise spectrum.



## Ideal noise shaping

- Using approximately ideal noise-shaping filters, the resulting noise spectrum is shaped like a two-step function
- Splitting into even and odd samples, effectively downsamples the signal without first using an antialiasing filter


(b) Spectrum of shaped $E$
- The noise in each description is therefore aliased



## Encoder and Decoder



## Noise-shaping \& source prediction

- For sources with memory, we replace the quantizer by a DPCM loop (closed-loop predictive quantization)
- We have two inner predictive quantization loops and one outer noise-shaping loop

The DPCM loop can actually also be existing audio coders

Noise-Shaped Predictive Coding for Multiple Descriptions of a Colored Gaussian Source.

Y. Kochman, J. Østergaard, R. Zamir. IEEE Data Compression Conference, 2008.

## Many descriptions by fractional sampling

- Upsample by $L \geq 2$
- Create K >= L descriptions
- Perform closed-loop (DPCM) quantization in each inner loop
- Perform one outer loop with noise shaping
- Perform decoding from arbitrary subsets of descriptions



## Key research questions

- Balanced descriptions: Can we guarantee that the distortion only depends upon the number of received descriptions and not which?
- Fractional under-sampling: Is it advantageous to choose $\mathrm{K}<\mathrm{L}$
- Decoder: How do we reconstruct from a given subset of descriptions?


## Distortion of different subsets of descriptions - a noise shaping strategy

- Assume we upsample a white Gaussian source X by L=5

$$
c_{1}=[1,-0.6200]
$$

- Let N be white Gaussian noise
- Let $\mathrm{Y} 1=\mathrm{X}+\mathrm{N} 1$, and $\mathrm{Y} 2=\mathrm{X}+\mathrm{N} 2$
- Use any two descriptions (out of 5)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& c_{2}=[1.0000,-0.4685,-0.2586,-0.0735,0.0520, \\
& \quad 0.1040,0.0909,0.0385,-0.0200,-0.0557,-0.0526] .
\end{aligned}
$$



$$
S_{N}(\omega)=\left\{\begin{array}{lll}
\delta^{1-K}, & |\omega| \leq \frac{\pi_{L}}{K}, & \boldsymbol{\delta} \geq 1 \\
\delta, & \pi>|\omega|>\frac{\pi_{L}}{K}
\end{array}\right.
$$

| Subsets $(i, j)$ | 1,2 | 1,5 | 2,3 | 3,4 | 4,5 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $Y_{1}^{(i, j)}:$ | -5.37 | -5.38 | -5.35 | -5.31 | -5.34 |
| $Y_{2}^{(i, j)}:$ | -4.16 | -4.18 | -4.15 | -4.11 | 4.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subsets $(i, j)$ | 1,3 | 1,4 | 2,4 | 2,5 | 3,5 |
| $Y_{1}^{(i, j)}:$ | -3.02 | -3.02 | -3.01 | -3.02 | -3.02 |
| $Y_{2}^{(i, j)}:$ | -4.00 | -4.00 | -4.00 | -4.00 | -4.00 |

## Optimal decoder for non-stationary signals

- From an MMSE point of view, a two-stage approach is optimal:
- First phase-shift each received description to achieve coherence with source
- Average phase-shifted descriptions to obtain final estimate of source
[Machiach, Østergaard, Zamir, ITW 2013]
- Optimality was established for $L=K$ but not for $L<K$ or $L>K$
- We propose a heuristic decoding rule as a two-stage approach:
- First replace lost decriptions by the "nearest" received description
- Lowpass filter and downsample by $L$ to source sampling frequency


## "MMSE" decoder versus Heuristic decoder - MSE

- Source is 10 sec . of Celine Dion music, sampled at 48 kHz
- Framesize is 120 samples, corresponding to 2.5 ms delay
- We upsample by L=2 and downsample by K=5 (descriptions)
- The ratio $\lambda$ of the in-band and out-ot-band spectra of the shaped noise is varied, which control the side versus central distortion ratio.



Figure 2: Central (left) and side (right) MSE distortion as a function of $\lambda$ using two different techniques for central reconstruction. Here $K=5, L=2$, and the frame size is 120 samples.

## "MMSE" vs Heuristic decoder: Objective Difference Grade (ODG)

| Impairment | ITU-R 5-grade scale | ODG |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Imperceptible | 5.0 | 0.0 |
| Perceptible but not annoying | 4.0 | -1.0 |
| Slightly annoying | 3.0 | -2.0 |
| Annoying | 2.0 | -3.0 |
| Very annoying | 1.0 | -4.0 |

Central distortion


Due to source aliasing in individual descriptions, the "MMSE" decoder does not necessarily guarantee a smooth transitions between blocks and it will course a low pass filtering of the signal.
(note that it is not the true MMSE decoder)


Simulation study: $300 \mathrm{kbps}, 2.5 \mathrm{~ms}$ delay, i.i.d. packet losses. Music files: 10 excerpts each of 20 sec . duration

## DSQ coder

- Oversample with $\mathrm{L}=2$ and make $\mathrm{K}=2$ or $\mathrm{K}=3$
descriptions
- Total coding sumrate is 300 kbps
- Total delay is 120 samples ( 2.5 ms at 48 kHz )
- 10 dim. LSF vectors: 10 kbps per packet.
- Gain factors: 2 kbps per packet.


## Opus coder

- Framesize set to 2.5 ms .
- Encoding at 100 and 150 kbps
- Repeating packets $\mathrm{K}=3$ or $\mathrm{K}=2$ times
- Total sumrate is 300 kbps .
- The effective packet loss rate is $p^{\wedge} \mathrm{K}$
- Note that: round $\left(100^{*} 0.15^{\wedge} 3\right)=0$.
- Opus demo implementation with: "-loss"



## Conclusions and discussion

- A flexible multiple-description low-delay audio coder is proposed
- Coding rate, latency, number of descriptions, and side-to-central distortion ratio can be arbitrarily chosen.
- The coder consists only of simple signal processing blocks
- Fractional sampling, linear prediction, scalar quantization, and noise-shaping.
- The main application envisioned is very low delay high-quality interactive audio
- At 2.5 ms delay, the performance was better than perceptually optimized coders such as Opus (followed by repetition coding)
- Open source Matlab code is available, see paper for details.

