## Machine Recognition of Sounds in Mixtures

## Outline

(1) Computational Auditory Scene Analysis
(2) Speech Recognition as Source Formation
(3) Sound Fragment Decoding
(4) Results \& Conclusions

Dan Ellis [dpwe@ee.columbia.edu](mailto:dpwe@ee.columbia.edu)
LabROSA, Columbia University, New York
Jon Barker [j.barker@dcs.shef.ac.uk](mailto:j.barker@dcs.shef.ac.uk)
SPandH, Sheffield University, UK

Ellis \& Barker
Machine Recognition of Sounds in Mixtures


# (1)Computational Auditory Scene Analysis (CASA) 

- Human sound organization:

Auditory Scene Analysis


- composite sound signal $\rightarrow$ separate percepts
- based on ecological constraints
- acoustic cues $\rightarrow$ perceptual grouping
- Computational ASA:

Doing the same thing by computer
...?
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## What is the goal of CASA?



- Separate signals?
- output is unmixed waveforms
- underconstrained, very hard ...
- too hard? not required?
- Source classification?
- output is set of event-names
- listeners do more than this...
- Something in-between? Identify independent sources + characteristics
- standard task, results?


## Segregation vs. Inference

- Source separation requires attribute separation
- sources are characterized by attributes (pitch, loudness, timbre + finer details)
- need to identify \& gather different attributes for different sources ...
- Need representation that segregates attributes
- spectral decomposition
- periodicity decomposition
- Sometimes values can't be separated
- e.g. unvoiced speech
- maybe infer factors from probabilistic model?

$$
p(O, x, y) \rightarrow p(x, y \mid O)
$$

- or: just skip those values, infer from higher-level context
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## Speech Recognition as Source Formation

- Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR): the most advanced sound analysis
- ASR extracts abstract information from sound
- (i.e. words)
- even in mixtures (noisy backgrounds) .. a bit
- ASR is not signal extraction: only certain signal information is recovered
- .. just the bits we care about
- Not CASA preprocessing for ASR: Instead, approach ASR as an example of CASA
- words = description of source properties
- uses strong prior constraints: signal models
- but: must handle mixtures!


## How ASR Represents Speech

- Markov model structure: states + transitions



State Transition Probabilities


- Generative model
- but not a good speech generator!

- only meant for inference of $p(X \mid M)$



## Sequence Recognition

- Statistical Pattern Recognition:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& M^{*}=\underset{M}{\operatorname{argmax}} P(M \mid X)=\underset{M}{\operatorname{argmax}} \frac{P(X \mid M) \cdot P(M)}{P(X)}
\end{aligned}
$$

- Markov assumption decomposes into frames:

$$
P(X \mid M)=\prod_{n} p\left(x_{n} \mid m_{n}\right) p\left(m_{n} \mid m_{n-1}\right)
$$

- Solve by searching over all possible state sequences $\left\{m_{n}\right\}$.. but with efficient pruning:
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## Approaches to sound mixture recognition

- Separate signals, then recognize
- e.g. (traditional) CASA, ICA
- nice, if you can do it
- Recognize combined signal
- 'multicondition training'
- combinatorics..
- Recognize with parallel models
- full joint-state space?
- divide signal into fragments, then use missing-data recognition
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## 3 Sound Fragment Decoding

- 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 true posterior distribution
- Goal:

Relate clean speech models $P(X \mid M)$ to speech-plus-noise mixture observations

- .. and make it tractable



## Missing Data Recognition

- Speech models $p(\mathbf{x} \mid m)$ are multidimensional...
- i.e. means, variances for every freq. channel
- need values for all dimensions to get $p(\bullet)$
- But: can evaluate over a subset of dimensions $x_{k}$
$p\left(\left.\mathbf{x}_{k}\right|^{m}\right)=\int p\left(\mathbf{x}_{k}, \mathbf{x}_{u} \mid m\right) d \mathbf{x}_{u}$
- Hence,
missing data recognition:


- hard part is finding the mask (segregation)



## Missing Data Results

- Estimate static background noise level $N(f)$
- Cells with energy close to background are considered "missing"

Factory Noise



- must use spectral features!
- But: nonstationary noise $\rightarrow$ spurious mask bits
- can we try removing parts of mask?
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## Comparing different segregations

- Standard classification chooses between models $M$ to match source features $X$

$$
M^{*}=\underset{M}{\operatorname{argmax}} P(M \mid X)=\underset{M}{\operatorname{argmax}} P(X \mid M) \cdot \frac{P(M)}{P(\nmid X)}
$$

- Mixtures: observed features $Y$, segregation $S$, all related by $P(X \mid Y, S)$

- Joint classification of model and segregation:
$P(M, S \mid Y)=P(M) \int P(X \mid M) \cdot \frac{P(X \mid Y, S)}{P(X)} d X \cdot P(S \mid Y)$
- $P(X)$ no longer constant



## 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 bands...
- $\quad P(S \mid Y)$ - segregation inferred from observation
- just assume uniform, find $S$ for most likely $M$
- or: use extra information in $Y$ to distinguish $S$ 's...
- Result:
- probabilistically-correct relation between clean-source models $P(X \mid M)$ and inferred, recognized source + segregation $P(M, S \mid Y)$



## Using CASA features

- $\quad P(S \mid Y)$ links acoustic information to segregation
- is this segregation worth considering?
- how likely is it?
- Opportunity for CASA-style information to contribute
- periodicity/harmonicity: these different frequency bands belong together
- onset/continuity:
this time-frequency region must be whole



## Fragment decoding

- Limiting $S$ to whole fragments makes hypothesis search tractable:

- choice of fragments reflects $P(S \mid Y) \cdot P(X \mid M)$ i.e. best combination of segregation and match to speech models
- Merging hypotheses limits space demands
- .. but erases specific history



## Multi-Source Decoding

- Match multiple models at once?

- disjoint subsets of cells for each source
- each model match $P\left(M_{x} \mid S_{x}, Y\right)$ is independent
- masks are mutually dependent: $P\left(S_{1}, S_{2} \mid Y\right)$
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## (4) 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
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## 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: Results



MLP classifier output


Sound object 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 | $\mathbf{1 9 7 \%}$ |
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## Summary \& Conclusions

- Scene Analysis
- necessary for useful hearing
- Recognition
- a model domain for scene analysis
- Fragment decoding
- recognition with partial observations
- combines segmentation \& model fitting
- Future work
- models of sources other than speech
- simultaneous 'perception' of multiple sources


