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## Auditory Scene Analysis



- Auditory Scene Analysis: describing a complex sound in terms of high-level sources/events
- ... like listeners do
- Hearing is ecologically grounded
- reflects 'natural scene' properties
- subjective, not absolute


## Sound, mixtures, and learning



- Sound
- carries useful information about the world
- complements vision
- Mixtures
- .. are the rule, not the exception
- medium is 'transparent', sources are many
- must be handled!
- Learning
- the 'speech recognition' lesson:
let the data do the work
- like listeners


## The problem with recognizing mixtures


"Imagine two narrow channels dug up from the edge of a lake, with handkerchiefs stretched across each one. Looking only at the motion of the handkerchiefs, you are to answer questions such as: How many boats are there on the lake and where are they?" (after Bregman'90)

- Received waveform is a mixture
- two sensors, N signals ... underconstrained
- Disentangling mixtures as the primary goal?
- perfect solution is not possible
- need experience-based constraints


## Human Auditory Scene Analysis

(Bregman 1990)

- How do people analyze sound mixtures?
- break mixture into small elements (in time-freq)
- elements are grouped in to sources using cues
- sources have aggregate attributes
- Grouping 'rules' (Darwin, Carlyon, ...):
- cues: common onset/offset/modulation, harmonicity, spatial location, ...

(after Darwin, 1996)



## Cues to simultaneous grouping

- Elements + attributes

- Common onset
- simultaneous energy has common source
- Periodicity
- energy in different bands with same cycle
- Other cues
- spatial (ITD/IID), familiarity, ...


## The effect of context

- Context can create an 'expectation’: i.e. a bias towards a particular interpretation
- e.g. Bregman's "old-plus-new" principle:

A change in a signal will be interpreted as an added source whenever possible


- a different division of the same energy depending on what preceded it


## Computational Auditory Scene Analysis (CASA)



- Goal: Automatic sound organization ; Systems to 'pick out' sounds in a mixture
- ... like people do
- E.g. voice against a noisy background
- to improve speech recognition
- Approach:
- psychoacoustics describes grouping 'rules'
- ... just implement them?


## The Representational Approach

(Brown \& Cooke 1993)

- Implement psychoacoustic theory

- 'bottom-up’ processing
- uses common onset \& periodicity cues
- Able to extract voiced speech:



## Restoration in sound perception

- Auditory 'illusions' = hearing what's not there
- The continuity illusion

- SWS

- duplex perception
- How to model in CASA?


## Adding top-down constraints

## Perception is not direct but a search for plausible hypotheses

- Data-driven (bottom-up)...

- objects irresistibly appear
vs. Prediction-driven (top-down)

- match observations with parameters of a world-model
- need world-model constraints...


## Approaches to sound mixture recognition

- Recognize combined signal
- 'multicondition training'
- combinatorics..
- Separate signals
- e.g. CASA, ICA
- nice, if you can do it
- Segregate features into fragments
- then missing-data recognition


## Aside: Evaluation

- Evaluation is a big problem for CASA
- what is the goal, really?
- what is a good test domain?
- how do you measure performance?
- SNR improvement
- not easy given only before-after signals: correspondence problem
- can do with fixed filtering mask; rewards removing signal as well as noise
- ASR improvement
- recognizers typically very sensitive to artefacts
- 'Real' task?
- mixture corpus with specific sound events...
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## (2) Speech recognition \& mixtures

- Speech recognizers are the most successful and sophisticated acoustic recognizers to date

- 'State of the art' word-error rates (WERs):
- 2\% (dictation) - 30\% (phone conv'ns)


## Learning acoustic models

- Goal: describe $p(X \mid M)$ with e.g. GMMs

- Separate models for each class
- generalization as blurring
- Training data labels from:
- manual annotation
- 'best path' from earlier classifier (Viterbi)
- EM: joint estimation of labels \& pdfs


## Speech + noise mixture recognition

- Background noise is biggest (?) problem facing current ASR
- Feature invariance approach:

Design features to reflect only speech

- e.g. normalization, mean subtraction
- Ideally, models of clean speech will match speech in noise
- .. although training on noisy examples can't hurt
- Static noise is relatively easy
- but: non-static noise?
- Alternative:

More complex models of the signal

- separate models for speech and 'rest'


## HMM decomposition

(e.g. Varga \& Moore 1991, Roweis 2000)

- Total signal model has independent state sequences for 2+ component sources
model 2

- New combined state space $q^{\prime}=\left\{q_{1} q_{2}\right\}$
- new observation pdfs for each combination

$$
p\left(X \mid q_{1}, q_{2}\right)
$$

## Problems with HMM decomposition

- $O\left(q_{k}\right)^{N}$ is exponentially large...
- Feature normalization no longer holds!
- each source has a different gain
$\rightarrow$ model at various SNRs?
- models typically don't use overall energy $C_{0}$
- each source has a different channel $H[k]$
- Modeling every possible sub-state combination is inefficient, inelegant and impractical
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## Fragment Recognition

(Jon Barker \& Martin Cooke, Sheffield)

- Signal separation is too hard! Instead:
- segregate features into partially-observed sources
- then classify
- Made possible by 'missing data' recognition
- integrate over uncertainty in observations for optimal posterior distribution
- Goal:

Relating clean speech models $P(X \mid M)$ to speech + noise mixture observations

- .. and making it tractable


## Comparing different segregations

- Standard classification chooses between models $M$ to match source features $X$
$M^{*}=\underset{M}{\operatorname{argmax}} P(M \mid X)=\underset{M}{\operatorname{argmax}} P(X \mid M) \cdot \frac{P(M)}{P(X)}$
- Mixtures $\rightarrow$ observed features $Y$, segregation $S$, all related by $P(X \mid Y, S)$

- spectral features allow clean relationship
- Joint classification of model and segregation:
$P(M, S \mid Y)=P(M) \int P(X \mid M) \cdot \frac{P(X \mid Y, S)}{P(X)} d X \cdot P(S \mid Y)$
- integral collapses in several cases...


## Calculating fragment matches

$$
P(M, S \mid Y)=P(M) \int P(X \mid M) \cdot \frac{P(X \mid Y, S)}{P(X)} d X \cdot P(S \mid Y)
$$

- $\quad P(X \mid M)$ - the clean-signal feature model
- $P(X \mid Y, S) / P(X)$ - is $X$ 'visible' given segregation?
- Integration collapses some channels...
- $\quad P(S \mid Y)$ - segregation inferred from observation
- just assume uniform, find $S$ for most likely $M$
- use extra information in $Y$ to distinguish $S$ 's e.g. harmonicity, onset grouping
- Result:
- probabilistically-correct relation between clean-source models $P(X \mid M)$ and inferred contributory source $P(M, S \mid Y)$


## Speech fragment decoder results

- Simple $P(S \mid Y)$ model forces contiguous regions to stay together
- big efficiency gain when searching $S$ space

- Clean-models-based recognition rivals trained-in-noise recognition


## Multi-source decoding

- Search for more than one source

- Mutually-dependent data masks
- Use e.g. CASA features to propose masks
- locally coherent regions
- Theoretical vs. practical limits
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## (4) Alarm sound detection

- Alarm sounds have particular structure
- people 'know them when they hear them'
- clear even at low SNRs

- Why investigate alarm sounds?
- they're supposed to be easy
- potential applications...
- Contrast two systems:
- standard, global features, $P(X \mid M)$
- sinusoidal model, fragments, $P(M, S \mid Y)$


## Alarms: Sound (representation)

- Standard system: Mel Cepstra
- have to model alarms in noise context: each cepstral element depends on whole signal
- Contrast system: Sinusoid groups
- exploit sparse, stable nature of alarm sounds
- 2D-filter spectrogram to enhance harmonics
- simple magnitude threshold, track growing
- form groups based on common onset

- Sinusoid representation is already fragmentary
- does not record non-peak energies


## Alarms: Mixtures

- Effect of varying SNR on representations:
- sinusoid peaks have ~ invariant properties



## Alarms: Learning

- Standard: train MLP on noisy examples

- Alternate: learn distributions of group features
- duration, frequency deviation, amp. modulation...

- underlying models are clean (isolated)
- recognize in different contexts...


## Alarms: Results



MLP classifier output


- Both systems commit many insertions at 0dB SNR, but in different circumstances:

| Noise | Neural net system |  |  | Sinusoid model system |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Del | Ins | Tot | Del | Ins | Tot |
| 1 (amb) | $7 / 25$ | 2 | $36 \%$ | $14 / 25$ | 1 | $60 \%$ |
| 2 (bab) | $5 / 25$ | 63 | $272 \%$ | $15 / 25$ | 2 | $68 \%$ |
| 3 (spe) | $2 / 25$ | 68 | $280 \%$ | $12 / 25$ | 9 | $84 \%$ |
| 4 (mus) | $8 / 25$ | 37 | $180 \%$ | $9 / 25$ | 135 | $576 \%$ |
| Overall | $\mathbf{2 2 / 1 0 0}$ | 170 | $\mathbf{1 9 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 / 1 0 0}$ | 147 | $\mathbf{1 9 7 \%}$ |

## Alarms: Summary

- Sinusoid domain
- feature components belong to 1 source
- simple ‘segregation’ (grouping) model
- alarm model as properties of group
- robust to partial feature observation
- Future improvements
- more complex alarm class models
- exploit repetitive structure of alarms
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- CASA as generative model parameterization:


Analysis structure


## Learning source models

- The speech recognition lesson:

Use the data as much as possible

- what can we do with unlimited data feeds?
- Data sources
- clean data corpora
- identify near-clean segments in real sound
- build up 'clean' views from partial observations?
- Model types
- templates
- parametric/constraint models
- HMMs
- Hierarchic classification vs. individual characterization...


## Personal Audio Applications

- Smart PDA records everything
- Only useful if we have index, summaries
- monitor for particular sounds
- real-time description
- Scenarios

- personal listener $\rightarrow$ summary of your day
- future prosthetic hearing device
- autonomous robots
- Meeting data, ambulatory audio


## Summary

- Sound
- carries important information
- Mixtures
- need to segregate different source properties
- fragment-based recognition
- Learning
- information extracted by classification
- models guide segregation
- Alarm sounds
- simple example of fragment recognition
- General sounds
- recognize simultaneous components
- acquire classes from training data
- build index, summary of real-world sound

