

## Speech Recovery for Real-World Self-Powered Intermittent Devices

### Introduction

- The Era of IoT Devices
- Wearable devices outnumbers the worlds popularity
- High cost in maintenance batteries in IoT devices — recharge/pollution
- Alternatives: Energy Harvesting Devices
  - Volatile data will be lost frequently due to power failures
  - Systems need to be frequently recovered after power resumption
- Self-Powered Intermittent System
- *Redoing* in battery-powered systems
- Intermittent completion by *preserving* forward progress at runtime



### Yu-Chen Lin<sup>1,3</sup>, Tsun-An Hsieh<sup>3</sup>, Kuo-Hsuan Hung<sup>3</sup>, Cheng Yu<sup>3</sup>, Harinath Garudadri<sup>5</sup>, Yu Tsao<sup>3</sup>, Tei-Wei Kuo<sup>1,2,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Computer Science and Information Engineering, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan <sup>2</sup>NTU High Performance and Scientific Computing Center, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan <sup>3</sup>Research Center for Information Technology Innovation, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan <sup>4</sup>Department of Computer Science, City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong <sup>5</sup>Qualcomm Institute, University of California, San Diego, USA



Poster #: 3750



# **Experimental Results**

### Intermittent Recording System Setup

Intermittent Microphone Device						
shold $(V_{on})$	2.8 V					
shold $(V_{off})$	2.3 V					
nergy consumption	5.6 mW					
EHM & Power Supply						
	200 uF					
ergy source	1.5 to 5.5 mW					
	(with a step of 0.25)					
gy source	2.0 to 5.0 mW					
	(with a step of 1.0)					

				no.			-		
nt	Interpolated		ISR+MSE			ISR+PL			
WER	PESQ	STOI	WER	PESQ	STOI	WER	PESQ	STOI	WER
0.99	1.30	0.53	0.99	1.01	0.51	0.97	1.66	0.74	0.86
-	441.7%	29.3%	0.0%	320.8	24.4%	2.0%	591.7%	80.5%	13.1%
0.96	1.58	0.66	0.95	1.28	0.67	0.91	2.11	0.84	0.59
-	209.8%	17.9%	1.0%	151.0%	19.6%	5.2%	313.7%	50.0%	38.5%
0.76	1.96	0.80	0.67	1.86	0.82	0.61	2.59	0.92	0.36
-	100.0%	8.1%	11.8%	89.8%	10.8%	19.7%	164.3%	24.3%	52.6%
0.36	2.61	0.92	0.34	2.75	0.93	0.35	3.23	0.97	0.26
-	34.5%	2.2%	5.6%	41.8%	3.3%	2.8%	66.5%	7.8%	27.8%
	•			•			•		

# • Interpolation improves both quality and

### ISR+MSE performs poorer than interpolation • *ISR+PL* is further improved from the

PESQ:  $66.5\% \rightarrow 591.7\%$ • STOI:  $7.8\% \rightarrow 80.5\%$ WER:  $13.1\% \rightarrow 52.6\%$ 

### Conclusion

### An ISR system that improves intermittent

### A simple 3-step architecture

Acoustic feature-preserved interpolation

Adoption of perceptual loss

Combination policy addresses the missing

Significant improvements in quality,

intelligibility, and classification accuracy