## SpeechWave





### Speech Acoustic Modelling from Raw Phase Spectrum

### Erfan Loweimi<sup>1</sup>, Zoran Cvetkovic<sup>2</sup>, Peter Bell<sup>1</sup> and Steve Renals<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Centre for Speech Technology Research (CSTR), University of Edinburgh



<sup>2</sup> King's College London

{e.loweimi, peter.bell, s.renals}@ed.ac.uk zoran.cvetkovic@kcl.ac.uk





## Outline

- Pros of acoustic modelling using *raw* phase spectrum
- Architectures: Single-stream vs Multi-stream
- Fusion level in multi-stream modelling
- Experimental results
- Conclusion





## Acoustic Modelling Using <u>Raw</u> Phase Spectrum

• Raw means using entire spectrum (frequency  $\geq 0$ )

- If FFT size = 512  $\rightarrow$  feature size = 257



- Advantages: Bypass feature engineering
  - Avoid inextricable information loss
  - Dealing with phase's complicated structure



WIVERS WIVERS KING'S LONDON

## Raw Phase-based Representations

**ICASSP 2021** 







## Architecture -- Single-head



#### - Phase-based single stream info:

\* wrapped, unwrapped, min-phase, source, filter phase spectra ...

\* ... or their group delay





### Architecture -- Multi-head







### Architecture -- Multi-head







## Single-Stream vs Multi-Stream







## Single-Stream vs Multi-Stream



$$\arg\{X_{MinPh}(\omega)\} = \arg\{X_{VT}(\omega)\} + \arg\{X_{Exc}(\omega)\}$$





## Advantages of Multi-Stream: Decomposition-Recombination (1)

- Single-stream
  - Input:  $Phase_{MinPhase} = 1 \times Phase_{VT} + 1 \times Phase_{Exc}$
  - Output:  $h(Phase_{MinPhase}; \theta_h)$





## Advantages of Multi-Stream: Decomposition-Recombination (1)

- Single-stream
  - Input:  $Phase_{MinPhase} = 1 \times Phase_{VT} + 1 \times Phase_{Exc}$
  - Output:  $h(Phase_{MinPhase}; \theta_h)$
- Multi-stream
  - Input: Phase<sub>VT</sub> & Phase<sub>Exc</sub> info streams
  - Output:  $h([f(VT; \theta_f), g(Exc; \theta_g)]; \theta_h)$



concatenation



Advantages of Multi-Stream: Decomposition-Recombination (2)

- Each stream (VT & Exc) is weighted/gated properly
  - ... importance to the task
- Learning bespoke transforms for each stream
  - Optimal chain of transforms for each stream is different
- Information fusion at optimal level of abstraction
  - ... instead of additive fusion at input level,  $Phase_{VT}$  +  $Phase_{Exc}$





## **Multi-Stream Architecture**

- Fusion@HigherLevels
  - More parameters
  - More pre-processing
  - Less post-processing

• Optimal Trade-off ???



Fusion@HigherLevels: Concat-0  $\rightarrow \dots \rightarrow$  Concat-3







## **Experimental Setup**

- Models built using PyTorch-Kaldi
  - CNNs: 4 layers, 1D, LayerNorm, ReLU
  - FCs: 5 Layers, BatchNorm, ReLU
- Alignments: Kaldi
- Tasks/Measure: TIMIT/PER and WSJ/WER
- Phase-based Source-Filter Separation based on [20]
- MVN@SpeakerLevel; Append: ±5 context frames
- No data augmentation or rescoring with RNNLM







## **Experimental Results**

#### TIMIT – Phone Recognition

<b>Fable 1</b> . TIMIT PER for different front-ends			
-		Dev	Eval
-	MFCC	17.1	18.6
	FBank	16.3	18.2
	Mag	16.8	17.8
	$Mag^{0.1}$	15.9	17.6
-	Phase-Wrapped	21.6	23.7
	Phase-UnWrapped	29.6	31.8
	Phase-MinPh	16.8	18.6
	GD-MinPh	16.9	18.4
	GD-VT	18.2	19.3
	GD-Exc	31.3	32.3
-	Concat-0	16.8	18.4
	Concat-1	16.3	18.1
	Concat-2	16.2	18.0
-	Concat-3	17.0	18.4

#### WSJ – LVCSR

Table 2. WSJ WER for different front-ends.			
	Dev	Eval-92	Eval-93
MFCC	10.4	6.8	10.4
FBank	9.1	5.9	8.8
Mag	9.3	5.9	9.1
$Mag^{0.1}$	8.8	5.5	9.0
Phase-Wrapped	9.9	6.1	10.4
Phase-UnWrapped	13.1	8.9	16.4
Phase-MinPh	9.3	5.8	9.4
GD-MinPh	8.3	5.1	7.8
GD-VT	8.6	5.4	7.6
GD-Exc	12.2	8.5	13.2
Concat-0	8.2	4.9	7.8
Concat-1	7.9	4.8	7.4
Concat-2	8.1	4.8	7.7
Concat-3	8.2	5.0	8.1

Acoustic modelling using raw phase spectrum works ...





# Discussion (1)

 Table 2. WSJ WER for different front-ends.

• Compared with magnitudebased features, comparable to better WERs are achieved using raw phase spectrum.

	Dev	1000000000000000000000000000000000000	$\frac{11 \text{ Crubs}}{\text{Eval}_03}$
MFCC	10.4	6.8	10.4
FBank	9.1	5.9	8.8
Mag	9.3	5.9	9.1
$Mag^{0.1}$	8.8	5.5	9.0
Phase-Wrapped	9.9	6.1	10.4
Phase-UnWrapped	13.1	8.9	16.4
Phase-MinPh	9.3	5.8	9.4
GD-MinPh	8.3	5.1	7.8
GD-VT	8.6	5.4	7.6
GD-Exc	12.2	8.5	13.2
Concat-0	8.2	4.9	7.8
Concat-1	7.9	4.8	7.4
Concat-2	8.1	4.8	7.7
Concat-3	8.2	5.0	8.1





# Discussion (2)



- Decent WER for wrapped phase
- Unwrapping increases WER
  - Instability ...
- Using GD improves WER



 Table 2. WSJ WER for different front-ends.

	Dev	Eval-92	Eval-93
MFCC	10.4	6.8	10.4
FBank	9.1	5.9	8.8
Mag	9.3	5.9	9.1
$Mag^{0.1}$	8.8	5.5	9.0
Phase-Wrapped	9.9	6.1	10.4
Phase-UnWrapped	13.1	8.9	16.4
Phase-MinPh	9.3	5.8	9.4
GD-MinPh	8.3	5.1	7.8
GD-VT	8.6	5.4	7.6
GD-Exc	12.2	8.5	13.2
Concat-0	8.2	4.9	7.8
Concat-1	7.9	4.8	7.4
Concat-2	8.1	4.8	7.7
Concat-3	8.2	5.0	8.1



# Discussion (3)

- Multi-stream outperforms single-stream
  - ... NO EXTRA INFO in multi-stream ...
- Optimal fusion level ↔
   Concat-1
  - Trade-off between ...
    - pre- & post-processing

 Table 2. WSJ WER for different front-ends.

	Dev	Eval-92	Eval-93
MFCC	10.4	6.8	10.4
FBank	9.1	5.9	8.8
Mag	9.3	5.9	9.1
$Mag^{0.1}$	8.8	5.5	9.0
Phase-Wrapped	9.9	6.1	10.4
Phase-UnWrapped	13.1	8.9	16.4
Phase-MinPh	9.3	5.8	9.4
GD-MinPh	8.3	5.1	7.8
GD-VT	8.6	5.4	7.6
GD-Exc	12.2	8.5	13.2
Concat-0	8.2	4.9	7.8
Concat-1	7.9	4.8	7.4
Concat-2	8.1	4.8	7.7
Concat-3	8.2	5.0	8.1







## Conclusion

- **Goal**: Acoustic modelling using speech's raw phase spectrum
- Architectures:
  - Single-head  $\leftarrow$  raw Phase<sub>wrapped</sub>, Ph<sub>unwrapped</sub>, Ph<sub>MinPh</sub>, Ph<sub>VT</sub>, Ph<sub>Exc</sub>
  - Multi-head/stream  $\leftarrow$  raw Source and Filter phase spectra
- Advantages of multi-stream approach & optimal fusion level discussed
- Tasks: Phone recognition (TIMIT), LVCSR (WSJ)
- **Future Work**: the proposed multi-stream phase-based approach is a general framework, potentially applicable to a wide range of tasks







## That's it!

- Thanks for your attention!
- Q & A

- Appendices:
  - Source-filter separation in the phase domain
  - Group delay (GD)







### Phase-based Source-Filter Separation (1)

$$x[n] = x_{VT}[n] * x_{Exc}[n]$$

$$\log |X(\omega)| = \log |X_{VT}(\omega)| + \log |X_{Exc}(\omega)|$$

$$\text{Hilbert Trans.} \quad \arg\{X_{MinPh}(\omega)\} = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \log |X(\omega)| * \cot(\frac{\omega}{2})$$

$$\arg\{X_{MinPh}(\omega)\} = \arg\{X_{VT}(\omega)\} + \arg\{X_{Exc}(\omega)\}$$

$$\operatorname{GD}_{MinPh}(\omega) = \operatorname{GD}_{VT}(\omega) + \operatorname{GD}_{Exc}(\omega)$$

Source and Filter components are **additive** in the Log-Mag, Min-phase phase or group delay domains.





### Phase-based Source-Filter Separation (2)

 $\arg\{X_{MinPh}(\omega)\} = \arg\{X_{VT}(\omega)\} + \arg\{X_{Exc}(\omega)\}$ 



 $Phase_{Min-Ph} \equiv Trend + Fluctuation \equiv Filter (VT) + Source (Exc)$ 





### Phase-based Source-Filter Separation (3)

$$\arg\{X_{MinPh}(\omega)\} = \arg\{X_{VT}(\omega)\} + \arg\{X_{Exc}(\omega)\}$$



*Phase*<sub>Min-Ph</sub> ≡ Trend + Fluctuation ≡ Filter (VT) + Source (Exc)





### Phase-based Source-Filter Separation (3)

 $\arg\{X_{MinPh}(\omega)\} = \arg\{X_{VT}(\omega)\} + \arg\{X_{Exc}(\omega)\}$ 



 $Phase_{Min-Ph} \equiv Trend + Fluctuation \equiv Filter (VT) + Source (Exc)$ 





### Phase-based Source-Filter Separation (3)

$$\arg\{X_{MinPh}(\omega)\} = \arg\{X_{VT}(\omega)\} + \arg\{X_{Exc}(\omega)\}$$



#### For more details please refer to ...

Loweimi, Erfan (2018) Robust Phase-based Speech Signal Processing From Source-Filter Separation to Model-Based Robust ASR. PhD thesis, University of Sheffield.



# Group Delay (GD) (1)

- Negative spectral derivative of phase spectrum
- Advantages ...

1) Additivity  $\rightarrow x(t) * y(t) \equiv GD_X(\omega) + GD_Y(\omega)$ 

2) High spectral resolution







# Group Delay (2)

- Advantages ...
  - 3) Similarity to mag spectrum for MinPhase signals
    - Similarity  $\rightarrow$  max@poles & min@zeros
    - $|X(\omega)|$  is replaceable with GD in the pipeline + some amendments



