Introduction

One of the major concerns in deploying speech recognition applications is the lack of robustness of the technology. One key aspect is the sensitivity to stationary or non-stationary background noise. Many approaches to noise robust speech recognition have been proposed before. Some modify the front-end signal processing of the recogniser while others work on the back-end, i.e. modelling and decoding. Stationary noise can be handled with techniques such as spectral subtraction while non-stationary noise is difficult to remove. Approaches that can handle non-stationary noise such as parallel model combination [1], blind source separation [2] and model-based decomposition [3], require explicitly modelling the statistics of the noise.

Besides these methods, multi-style training is well known to give superior recognition performance. The acoustic model is trained on corrupted speech. It is a very effective and practical way to improve the noise robustness of a speech recogniser hence is widely applied on many commercial products such as VOCON 3200 of Nuance communication. Additionally, multi-style training can easily be combined with speech enhancement schemes. In [11], the author gives a survey of multi-style training. Here "style" especially refers to the acoustic environmental condition, while "multi" means that the training data consists of speech embedded in different types of noise. The noisy training data can either be obtained by direct recording or by artificially adding particular kinds of noise into the training data. The former way is expensive for car application because the data has to work on the back-end, i.e. modelling and decoding. Stationary noise can be handled with techniques such as spectral subtraction while non-stationary noise is difficult to remove. Approaches that can handle non-stationary noise such as parallel model combination [1], blind source separation [2] and model-based decomposition [3], require explicitly modelling the statistics of the noise.

Missing Data Techniques (MDT) based speech recogniser only relies on the knowledge of the clean speech. It increases the noise robustness of the recogniser by curing the mismatch between the acoustic model and the observations when stationary or non-stationary noise is present. Hence training various acoustic models according to the environment noise in the target application is not a must in MDT and the cost is greatly reduced with respect to the multi-style training.

MDT relies on the property that some regions in the spectrogram are dominated by the speech signal to be recognized, while other regions are corrupted by unexpected noise. MDT solutions tell, in the frontend, which frequency components of a frame of speech spectrum are corrupted by noise (unreliable) and, in the backend, how to impute them with the acoustic model and non-corrupted components (reliable). This reliability information is represented in a spectral mask which is estimated from the noisy data. In the backend, the imputation step replaces the unreliable observed speech by clean speech estimation to assure a good match between the clean acoustic model and the corrupted data.

In [4], MDT is applied based on continuous density Hidden Markov Model (HMM). However, the acoustic model must be expressed as a mixture of Gaussians with diagonal covariance matrix in the log spectral domain, where the masks are represented. MDT recognisers working with spectral features (SMDT) exhibit a loss of accuracy while using the cepstral domain increases accuracy due to the property that the Discrete Cosine Transform (DCT) decorrelates the log-spectra. In [5], the cepstral MDT (CMDT) system shows superior noise robustness in comparison with a SMDT system. In CMDT, the cosine transformation is applied on the diagonal cepstral covariance matrix. Imputing clean speech based on observed noisy speech and a Gaussian mixture of a clean acoustic model with the assumption that the difference between noisy speech and the clean speech to be imputed is non-negative, requires solving a Non-Negative Least Square (NNLSQ) problem. Solving a NNLSQ leads to a severe computational load. In [6], an alternative MDT formulation through the introduction of the PROSPECT features is presented. It reduces the computational requirements of NNLSQ and maintains the accuracy of CMDT at the same time.

In the next section, MDT masks and imputation are first reviewed, followed by the introduction of the PROSPECT features. The resulting implementation is benchmarked on the SpeechDat CAR Flemish database [10] and compared with the results from the VOCON 3200 (version 2.6) to see how far the MDT is away from a state-of-the-art speech recogniser.

Missing Data Techniques

In MDT, when the speech signal is contaminated by additive noise, a spectral mask indicates at each time frame which spectral components are labelled as missing or unreliable (dominated by noise) and which are reliable (dominated by speech). A detail survey of MDT masks can be found in [8]. Using a mask, a $D$-dimensional vector $y$ containing the spectral observations of frame $t$ can be split into an unreliable part $y_u$ and a reliable part $y_r$:

$$y' = [y_u \quad y_r']$$

(1)

The reliable components of the clean speech $s$ are estimated as the noisy observation $y$. The assumption that the noise is
additive yields the constraint in each unreliable filter bank channel that the clean speech to be imputed $s_n$ is bounded:

$$ s_n \leq y_n $$

(2)

In data imputation, the unreliable components $s_n$ are estimated under constraint (2), producing a complete observation vector $s$. The estimation uses a (Gaussian) model of speech, which is given by the current search hypothesis, i.e., the imputation is integrated with the decoding process. In [4], the authors suggest a diagonal covariance MDT solution in the log spectral domain where the mask is presented. The bounded imputation carried out per Gaussian and per frame is straightforward in this case. For the sake of better accuracy, cepstral MDT is introduced in [5], where each Gaussian is evaluated separately as well. Hence the acoustic model can be evaluated on complete spectral data by mixture-wise imputation. The minimization of the cost function of a mixture

$$ (s - \mu_\gamma)'^T C^{-1} (s - \mu_\gamma) = (y - x - \mu_\gamma)'^T C^{-1} (y - x - \mu_\gamma) $$

(3)

becomes an NNLSQ problem over $x$, which is the difference between the imputed speech and the noisy observation. $C$ is the DCT matrix and $\mu_\gamma$ denotes the spectral mean of the mixture. The NNLSQ problem can be solved by gradient descent. However the computational load is significantly higher than for SMDT because we have to calculate the inverse covariance or the precision matrix $C^{-1}$ during decoding. To save computational efforts, PROSPECT features are introduced.

**PROSPECT Features**

The PROSPECT [6] feature is composed of a cepstral vector $c$ and a projected vector $d$ formulated by:

$$ p = \begin{bmatrix} p_c \\ p_d \end{bmatrix} s = \begin{bmatrix} c \\ d \end{bmatrix} $$

(4)

$s$ is the log spectrum. $C_K$ is the $K$ by $D$ orthonormal DCT matrix. $K$ is much lower than 13, e.g. $K=4$, which means only the lower order spectral correlations are captured by the $K$ cepstral coefficients statistically. $P_d = I - C_K C_K'$ hence $d = s - C_K C_d s$, which is spectral residual after $c$ is removed from $s$.

The cost function to be minimised is:

$$ (s - \mu_\gamma)' C_K^{-1} C_K (s - \mu_\gamma) + \alpha P_d'^T P_d (s - \mu_\gamma) = (s - \mu_\gamma)' A (s - \mu_\gamma) $$

(5)

$\alpha$ is the stream weight of $d$ and is 0.5 in our case. $A$ is the precision matrix. When using gradient descent to solve NNLSQ, the gradient vector is $A(s - \mu_\gamma)$ and can be calculated using the lower order matrices $C_K$, $C_K'$, diagonal matrices $\Sigma_d$, $\Sigma_c$ and the vector $s - \mu_\gamma$. Hence computational efforts are saved by avoiding a series of multiplications with the full precision matrix as is required in the imputations for CMDT. The PROSPECT based recogniser has been proven to have an equivalent performance as the CMDT recogniser.

**Experiments**

The PROSPECT MDT recogniser and the PROSPECT recogniser with MDT disabled, as well as the VOCON 3200 recogniser are tested in the experiments on the SpeechDat CAR Flemish database.

**Recognition tasks**

The database consists of noisy utterances recorded in different driving conditions. Speech is recorded using four channels from close, medium and far field microphones. The test utterances are binned per 5 dB SNR in the range of 0–30 dB SNR. Four grammars are included in the experiments, isolated words, spelling, natural number and “when” grammars. The isolated words grammar has 637 words or commands in its dictionary. The spelling grammar allows an arbitrary number of repetitions of a letter of the alphabet. The natural number grammar allows the speaker to say a number in the range from 1 to 999,999 in a natural way as well as money amounts in the same range. The “when” grammar allows the speaker to specify a point in time. This can be a date, or a time, but also relative indications like “tomorrow” or “in one week” are allowed.

**Results**

Figure 1-4 shows the experiments results per 5 dB SNR bin (regardless of channel) of the above four grammars.

**Figure 1:** WER of the isolated words obtained with VOCON 3200 recogniser, the PROSPECT MDT based recogniser and the PROSPECT recogniser without MDT.
Discussion and future work

In almost all cases, the MDT recognizer outperforms its variant that is not using noise compensation, even at high SNR. At an SNR above 15 dB, the MDT system and the VOCON3200 recognizer have comparable performance. At an SNR below 15 dB, the MDT system is outperformed by the VOCON3200. This result is not surprising given the different assumptions about the noise, the differences in feature representations, the differences in amount and type of training data, etc. The errors in the estimated masks are also one of the potential reasons.

Despite the performance gap between the MDT recogniser and the VOCON recogniser, MDT system is versatile and a lot cheaper in data collection and is not tuned to its operating environment: it does not require collecting in-car training data from the acoustic environment that it will be deployed in.

Since we conclude from this result analysis that multi-style training works well when dealing with corrupted speech, using multi-style trained acoustic model in MDT is a potential further direction, though this compromises on the foundation for MDT that we want to make minimal assumptions about the noise. Moreover, the accuracy of mask estimation should be increased. Hereto, longer context information will also be considered.

Though we did not provide any analysis of this aspect, MDT-based systems are also computationally more expensive.
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