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#### Abstract

Speech recognition systems have historically used context-dependent phones as acoustic units because they perform well and allow leveraging of linguistic information such as pronunciation lexicons. However, it is desirable in some cases to automatically discover acoustic units, particularly when dealing with a new language for which minimal linguistic resources exist. The process of discovering acoustic units usually consists of two stages: segmentation and clustering. In this paper, we introduce a nonparametric Bayesian approach for segmentation in which Hidden Markov models (HMMs) with an unbounded number of states are used to segment the utterance. A 75% relative improvement in finding boundaries compared to manually segmented data is demonstrated on the TIMIT Corpus.

**Index Terms—**nonparametric Bayesian models, hierarchical Dirichlet processes, speech segmentation

#  Introduction

Acoustic unit selection is a critical issue in many speech recognition applications where there are limited linguistic resources or training data available for the target language. For example, recently IARPA’s Babel program  sponsored a competition to create a speech to text system in a mystery language in one week of time using very limited resources. Though traditional context-dependent phone models perform well when there is ample data, automatic discovery of acoustic units offers the potential to provide good performance for resource deficient languages with complex linguistic structures (e.g., African click languages).

Most approaches to automatic discovery of acoustic units -[4] do this in two steps: segmentation and clustering. Segmentation is accomplished using a heuristic method that detects changes in energy and/or spectrum. Similar segments are then clustered using an agglomerative method such as a decision tree. Advantages of this approach include the potential for higher performance than that obtained using traditional linguistic units, and the ability to automatically discover pronunciation lexicons.



Figure 1. Segmentation of a speech utterance produced through a process of automatic unit discovery is shown by overlaying the duration and index of each unit on the waveform. The height of each rectangle overlay simply indicates the index of that unit.
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In this paper, we propose the use of nonparametric Bayesian methods for segmentation. In such problems, the precise number of units (or segments) is unknown. One approach is to exhaustively search through a model space consisting of many possible parameterizations. An alternative approach is based on a nonparametric Bayesian statistical model  in which the model complexity can be inferred directly from the data. Segmenting an utterance into acoustic units can be approached in a manner similar to that used in speaker diarization , where the goal is to segment an audio file into regions that correspond to a specific speaker. Fox et al. used one state per speaker and demonstrated segmentation without knowing the number of speakers a priori. Here, we demonstrate that a similar approach can be used to discover acoustic units.

Our approach is demonstrated in Figure 1 for an example utterance from the TIMIT Corpus [7]. The segmentation is performed using an extension of Hidden Markov models with an unbounded number of states and mixtures. This model is known as infinite HMM or more recently a Hierarchical Dirichlet Process HMM (HDP–HMM) . It uses a hierarchical Bayesian model to define a nonparametric Bayesian HMM. The main virtue of this relatively new model is that the model complexity is determined in a data-driven fashion .

**Relation to Prior Work:** In this paper, we propose a new algorithm for the segmentation step in acoustic unit discovery. We apply a nonparametric Bayesian approach [5] known as an HDP-HMM [6]. Previously a dynamic programming method was applied that incorporated a heuristic stopping criterion [2]-[4].

#  Hierarchical Dirichlet Processes



Figure 2. A graphical representation of an HDP-HMM is shown that integrates a mixture distribution model with an infinite HMM.

Hidden Markov models (HMMs) are a class of doubly stochastic processes in which discrete state sequences are modeled as a Markov chain. In the following discussion we will denote the state of the Markov chain at time *t* with *zt*. An observation at time *t* is conditionally independent of the state of the HMM, and is denoted by . In an HMM, we do not know the exact identity of the previous state. Instead, we could have reached *zt* from any state with some probability. In an infinite HMM, the set of predecessor states is infinite, so instead of a transition matrix, we have distribution for the predecessor states which is modeled as a Dirichlet process (DP). We denote this distribution as π*j*. The Markovian property of an HMM is denoted by , which implies the current state is only a function of the previous state.

An HDP-HMM is an extension of HMM in which the number of states can be unbounded. Since we want the set of predecessor states to be reused at each point in time, so that we can return to various states via a process similar to a self-transition in an HMM, the DPs should be somehow linked together. In order to make sharing of states possible, the base distribution for each DP should be discrete. The base distribution should have broad support, which simply means all DPs share a common discrete distribution that is itself a drawn from a DP. We refer to this structure as a Hierarchical Dirichlet Process (HDP) .

Unlike an HDP in which an association of data to a group is assumed to be known a priori, we must infer this association in an HDP-HMM. A major problem with the original formulation of HDP-HMM is state persistence. HDP-HMM has a tendency to create many redundant states and switch rapidly among them . This is mitigated by introducing a sticky parameter, κ, to the definition of HDP-HMM, as shown in Eq. :

 (1)

This parameter encourages consecutive data to belong to the same group (in HMM terms, it increases the probability of a self-transition). The original HDP-HMM formulation can be derived as a special case by setting κ = 0. In Figure 2, we depict a graphical representation of this model . Observations are generated from a parametric distribution denoted by . Indices *j* and *k* are determined by the state and mixture numbers.

In Eq. (1), we actually show a particular construction of a DP, known as a Griffiths, Engen and McCloskey (GEM) model, or stick-breaking construction, which generates a DP by successively sampling a beta distribution over the remaining part of a stick with an initial length equal to one. The distribution, β, is the base distribution that links all DPs together, and can be interpreted as the expected value of transition distribution. The state at time *t* is denoted as *zt*, *st* is the mixture component at time *t*, and *xt* is the observation at time *t*. This model has been successfully used in several speech segmentation tasks [6].

The final ingredient in this model is an inference algorithm. Eq.  describes a generative model. Inference algorithms are used to infer the values of the latent variables, in this case *zt* and *st*. There are several popular approaches for inference including the block sampler  used in this work. This sampler employs a Markovian structure of the model to improve its performance. A variation of the forward-backward procedure is used that enables us to sample the state sequence *z1:T* at once.

However, a block sampler needs a fixed truncation level *Kz* to be specified in advance. This truncation level represents the maximum number of states that the inference algorithm can find. It should be noted that the resulting algorithm is different from a parametric Bayesian HMM because it induces a sparse subset of the *Kz* possible states . Similarly, a fixed truncation level *Ks* is used to represent the maximum number of mixtures per state. In practice if both *Kz* and *Ks* are sufficiently large the results will be the same as if we use an infinite truncation level.

#  Experiments

To evaluate the proposed algorithm, we used data extracted from the TIMIT database . This data was chosen because of the existence of highly accurate manual segmentations and transcriptions. Each utterance was converted into standard MFCC features, and then L frames of data are averaged to produce one output frame. This averaging process is done to ensure that segments have a minimum duration of L frames. Typically, L varies from 1 to 3, corresponding to minimum durations of 10 to 30 msec.

The resulting feature vector was then used as the input to an HDP-HMM for segmentation. A conjugate prior is used to ensure that the posterior distribution remains in the same family of distributions as the prior. Since the posterior distribution in our model is a multivariate normal distribution, we use the normal inverse Wishart distribution for the prior.

To measure the performance of the segmentations, we used a simple approach that estimates within-class and out-of-class performance. A similarity score was used that consists of a pair numbers: (1) a measure of the similarity of segments with identical labels, which we refer to as in-class segments, and (2) a measure of the similarity of segments with non-identical labels, which we refer to as out-of-class segments. Our goal is to generate segmentations with a large in-class score and a small out-of-class score. The similarity score is defined as:

  (2)

In this equation, *s1* is the in-class similarity score and is defined as the average over the absolute correlation between different instances of segments with identical labels. Similarly, *s2* is the out-of-class similarity score and is defined as the average over the absolute correlation between different instances of segments with different labels.

It should be noted that the similarity score functions much like a likelihood score – it increases monotonically with an increase in the number of classes (with a maximum obtained by setting the number of classes equal to the number of segments.) Therefore, for a meaningful comparison, the number of classes being compared for two algorithms must be the same. Also, since the labels for each segment are generated automatically, the segment identities are arbitrary and cannot be directly compared from one experiment to the next. This is another reason we employed the similarity measure described in Eq. (2).

Table 1. A demonstration of the HDP­‑HMM approach to automatic discovery of acoustic units. The in‑class similarity scores for the proposal algorithm are significantly higher than those for the manual segmentations.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Experiment** | **Params.****(Ns / Nc)** | **ManualSegmentations** | **HDP-HMM** |
| Kz=100, Ks=1, L=1 | 70/70 | (0.44,0.28) | (0.82,0.27) |
| Kz=100, Ks=1, L=2 | 33/33 | (0.44,0.28) | (0.77,0.27) |
| Kz=100, Ks=1, L=3 | 23/23 | (0.44,0.28) | (0.75,0.28) |
| Kz=100, Ks=5, L=1 | 55/139 | (0.44,0.28) | (0.90,0.28) |
| Kz=100, Ks=5, L=2 | 53/73 | (0.44,0.28) | (0.87,0.28) |
| Kz=100, Ks=5, L=3 | 43/51 | (0.44,0.28) | (0.83,0.27) |

For these experiments the data consisted of all 630 speakers in the training portion of the TIMIT database. There were 10 utterances per speaker, or a total of 6300 utterances in this data set. We also used sentence SA1 for speakers FALK0 and FCJF0 to investigate some issues in more detail. However, for our numerical results, all utterances from all speakers were used.

In the HDP-HMM model, there are several parameters that must be adjusted: the number of frames in a block (L), the truncation level for the number of states (Kz), and the truncation level for the number of mixtures (Ks) per state. Kz and Ks should be set to be larger than the expected number of states and number of mixtures per state. Computational complexity increases linearly with the size of the training data, but quadratically with Kz and Ks. This is why Kz and Ks need to be carefully adjusted.

In Table 1, we demonstrate the impact these parameters have on segmentation performance. The first column contains a variety of settings for the above parameters. The second column contains the number of discovered states (Ns) and classes (Nc). Each state can contain a different number of mixture components, and each mixture component defines a class, so the total number of mixture components is equal to the number of classes. We have observed that the number of states, Ns, is typically in the range of 20 to 75. The number of classes is less than Kz\*Ks.

Similarity scores for the manual segmentations and the HDP‑HMM algorithm are shown in the last two columns of Table 1. The number of classes for the manual segmentations is fixed to 41, the number of phones used to mark the corpus. For HDP‑HMM, the number of classes varies between 23 and 139 depending on the configuration settings. Note that increasing the number of classes results in an increase in the in-class similarity scores, but the out-of-class similarity scores remain relatively constant. If we consider the second row of the table, we observe that the number of classes (33) found is roughly comparable to the number of phones (41), yet the similarity score for HDP‑HMM is 75% larger (0.77 vs. 0.44). This demonstrates that the HDP‑HMM segmentation approach is promising.

In Table 2, excerpts from automatically discovered lexicons are shown for four different parameter configurations. This data resulted from processing utterance SA1 for speakers FALK0 and FCJF0. The labels shown are arbitrarily assigned during the automatic discovery process. Though we don’t expect the value of the label to be repeated for a different set of data, we can see that there is a general similarity in the sequence of labels for similar words spoken by different speakers. For example, word “all” for the first experiment is represented with segments “60‑54‑80‑41” for FALK0 and “29‑54‑80‑41” for FCJF0.

Further analysis revealed that the segments 60 and 29 are also acoustically close. The normalized distance between the mean of the Gaussian distributions that represent each segment is 11.6 while the average distance between two arbitrary segments is 41.1. This indicates that segments 29 and 60 are accounting for slightly different pronunciations of the initial phone. The labels are used elsewhere for words containing the same initial phone.

Segments derived using the proposed algorithm follow an n-gram statistical structure. For example, in the second row of Table 2, segment 79 always follows segment 18, and segment 12 always follows segments 70, 79 and 68 (which are very close in terms of acoustic distance).

The first two experiments use a single Gaussian emission for each state (Ks=1). The last two experiments use Gaussian mixtures (Ks=5) where the maximum number of mixtures per state is Ks. The flexibility added by the mixture model improves the consistency of the segmentation. For example, by comparing the word “she” for experiments one and third we can see for the third experiment, segmentations for both speakers are much more similar than segmentations for the first experiment. Recall that in this model the number of mixtures per state can vary, and the number of derived classes grows only as needed based on the complexity of the data. The model essentially adapts to the data.

Figure 1 demonstrates that the boundaries founded by the proposed method approximately coincide with boundaries found from manually segmentation of the speech utterance into phonemes. However, in some cases the automatically discovered segments combine several phonemes (e.g., /aa r/) while in other instances a single phoneme is divided into more than one segment (e.g., /s/). We demonstrated that when the number of classes is comparable to the number of phonemes the similarity score is higher for the automatically discovered segments. This suggests that the splitting/merging phenomena inherent to the HDP‑HMM improve the segmentation process and the resulting segments can generate a set of acoustic units that represent the data more consistently.

#  ConclusionS

We have investigated application of an HDP-HMM model to segmentation of speech data. It was shown that this segmentation model produces meaningful and consistent results. Discovered boundaries found by our algorithm generally coincide with the boundaries for manually segmented phonemes. However, sometimes, an automatically discovered segment can cover more (or less) than an entire phoneme. It was shown that for a comparable number of classes, the HDP‑HMM model improves segmentation accuracy by more than 75%.

Future research will be focused on clustering segments produced by HDP-HMM and automatic generation of a corresponding lexicon. This step can also be implemented using a nonparametric Bayesian approach, thereby achieving our goal of a system entirely based on nonparametric Bayesian approaches.

Table 2. Samples of the lexicons are shown for several parameter configurations. The labels in the second and third columns are arbitrarily assigned to acoustic units. There is a reasonable amount of consistency between words with similar phonetic transcriptions.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Exp.** | **FALK0** | **FCJF0** |
| Kz=100Ks=1L=1 | she: 81-2-7-41wash: 45-25-29-54-59-30-94-81water: 25-29-54-59-28-71-72-98all: 60-54-80-41year: 41-74-79-89-71-72-76-83 | she: 27-67-40-41-68wash: 41-45-25-29-54-73-8-4-27-81-17water: 29-54-28-98all: 29-54-80-41year: 41-74-89-71 |
| Kz=100Ks=1L=2 | she: 60-18-79-70wash: 75-10-51-91-52-60-61water: 10-51-3-99all: 10-51-70year: 70-48-99-87 | she: 27-67-40-41-68wash: 75-10-51-91-19-54-60-61water: 10-51-3all: 10-51-70year: 70-48 |
| Kz=100Ks=5L=1 | she: 35-75-43-89wash: 70-29-48-47-88-7-100-35-41water: 48-47-88-73-50-57-45all: 25-87-7-43year: 43-31-23-18-13 | she: 35-76-43-89wash:70-48-47-88-7-15-6-35-41water: 47-88-39-47all: 47-30-43year: 43-76-13 |
| Kz=100Ks=5L=3 | she: 24-6-86wash: 43-26-30-73-24water: 43-26-30-50-69all: 26-30-69-55year: 55-57-50-69-7 | she: 17-38-6-30-58wash: 5-43-26-30-76-10-17-59-78water: 26-50-80all: 26-69year: 30-55-57-56 |
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