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Isn’t this a hearing conference?

During the evolution of human speech, the articulatory motor system has presumably structured its output to match those rhythms the auditory system can best apprehend. Similarly, the auditory system has likely become tuned to the complex acoustic signal produced by combined jaw and articulator rhythmic movements. Both auditory and motor systems must, furthermore, build on the existing biophysical constraints provided by the neuronal infrastructure.

– Giraud and Poeppel (2012)
attributed to Heimbauer et al. (2011) and Liberman and Mattingley (1985)
Is it all moot?

- There is now **wavenet** (left)
  - Synthesises waveform directly

- Also
  - Lyrebird [https://lyrebird.ai](https://lyrebird.ai)
  - Char2Wav [http://josesotelo.com/speechsynthesis/](http://josesotelo.com/speechsynthesis/)
  - Tacotron (not strictly waveform synthesis)

- Do we really need to understand the production mechanism?
Part 1

Background applications
Text to speech synthesis

• It works!
  • Basic TTS in its raw form is a solved problem
The EMIME scenario

Traditional speech-to-speech translation

Recognition → Translation → Synthesis

Speaker-to-speaker adaptation

ASR models → Adaptation → TTS models

Speech in → Recognition → Translation → Synthesis → Speech out
Example of adaptation

- Note:
  - 16 kHz speech (not such high quality for synthesis)
  - Wall St. Journal samples (an ASR database, more males)
  - VTLN adaptation (quite simple, gender characteristics)
What can be done with adaptation

Vocal tract length normalisation

- Distance between larynx and lips
  - Longer in males
    - “Lower voice”
  - Shorter in females
    - “Higher voice”
- Adaptation does more than alter vocal tract length
  - But VTL is easy to visualise
Bilinear warping

- Bilinear warping
  - can stretch or shrink a vocal tract
  - Enough to distinguish male / female
  - It can also be represented as a linear transform

- Very quick to learn
  - Only one speech example!
  - Only one parameter to learn
  - Can be prior for more sophisticated techniques
Fast, difficult adaptation

- Note:
  - 48 kHz samples (quite good!)
  - RJS is a HTS2010 / Festival / Blizzard challenge voice
  - VTLN + SMAPLR adaptation
- Roger: 1 sentence
  - Roger (real)
- Robyn: 4 sentence
  - Robyn (real)
Speech synthesis

- TTS involves lots of listening tests e.g., Alex’s page
  - Which sounds most like the original?
  - Which is most natural?
  - None of them! They all sound unnatural!

- There is a characteristic “buzzy” quality
  - The effect of the vocoder is stronger than that of the thing we’re trying to modify
Part 2

Approaches to vocoding
“One cannot understand speech recognition without understanding speech synthesis. One cannot understand either without understanding speech coding.”
There is no hope at the high levels if the lower ones don’t work!
Non-parametric vs. parametric

• MPEG-like codecs do not care about content
  • What comes out is what went in
  • May use LP, may not
  • mp3 uses LP

• Generally structure doesn’t matter

• In TTS, we want to be able to control
  • Voice character
  • Pitch
  • Emotion

• Structure matters!

• Examples:
  • STRAIGHT, YANG, Vocaine
  • WORLD: http://ml.cs.yamanashi.ac.jp/world/english/
The source-filter model

Donald Ayler, 1942–2007
(with Albert Ayler, 1936–1970)
© The Wire Magazine
Source-filter for speech

**Excitation**  

**System**  

(Simplistic frequency-domain view)
Parametric vocoding

- Parametric vocoding breaks the signal into physiologically motivated components
  - System
    - Spectral shape
  - Excitation
    - Pitch
      - May include voicing detection
    - Harmonic component (think vowels)
      - Depends on voicing
    - Noise component (think consonants)
    - Harmonic to noise ratio
      - Could be band-dependent
Spectral shape

• Spectral shape is quite well understood! Two choices:

• DFT
  • STRAIGHT is a DFT method

• Linear prediction
  • Tends to be lower dimensional
  • Attractive as it has a physiological basis
• STRAIGHT is essentially a pitch-synchronous DFT
  • Gets rid of pitch artefacts

• Later iteration: “Tandem STRAIGHT”

• STRAIGHT is known as a vocoder
  • Uses mixed excitation (see later)
  • See also: CheapTrick (Morise, 2015)
Linear prediction

Frame 220
Excitation

Vocal folds do not produce impulses!
Excitation

• Our best guess is the LF model
  • Opening phase
  • Closing phase
  • Discontinuity when vocal folds come into contact

• This is the glottal flow derivative

LF in frequency domain

- LF shapes vocalisation, not noise
  - HF is just noise
  - There is cut-off
- The whole thing is subject to system response
Separation of harmonics from noise

• Mixed excitation (Yoshimura et al. 2001)

(MLSA: Mel Log Spectrum Approximation)
Separation of harmonics from noise

- **HNM:** Harmonic plus noise model (Y. Stylianou, PhD, 1996)
  - Determine a maximum voiced frequency
  - Model everything below that as harmonics
  - Model everything above that as noise

- These models are pretty good!
Part 3

Shortcomings
Degradation in vocoding

- The cause(s) of unnaturalness is (are) not well understood. There are several plausible theories:

- Voicing detection
  - For sure, incorrect voicing will cause artefacts.

- Incorrect aperiodicity
  - Aperiodicity is the part that is not voicing.
  - Note: voiced fricatives have both periodic and aperiodic components.

- Framing
  - Mains hum is “buzzy”; the buzz is the frame rate.

- Plus:
  - It's worse in TTS than just vocoding.
  - It's worse if you mess with the signal.
Pitch Extractor

• Issues:
  • Not defined for unvoiced segments
  • Tendency towards doubling and halving errors
  • 1001 different algorithms
Is pitch extraction solved?

Junichi’s method:

“f0 is first extracted using a wide range over a whole database, then a range is determined for each speaker and f0 is extracted again using three methods. Finally a median value of the three methods is chosen.”

• So, something is broken!

• A hypothesis
  • Can we fix vocoding by fixing gross pitch errors?
Basic pitch extraction


• Boersma’s algorithm is in Praat
  • Pretty good
  • Essentially autocorrelation, but with lots of extra hacks

• Autocorrelation also gives a harmonic to noise ratio
  • You can convert HNR to a variance on the estimate
  • If so, you don’t need a voicing decision
Use HNR as precision in a Kalman filter
The SSP vocoder

• Given pitch and harmonic to noise ratio, you can build a vocoder! Ingredients
  • Continuous pitch extraction
  • Linear Prediction based spectral shape
  • “Assorted” excitation methods
  • Implemented in python using numpy

• Excitation examples
  • Original (The natural recording at 22 kHz)
  • Whisper (Pure Gaussian noise excitation)
  • Robot (Pure impulse excitation, constant pitch)
  • Impulse (Impulse & noise excitation, continuous pitch)
Tentative pitch conclusion

• LPC actually works very well

• Accurate pitch seems not to matter
  • At least, it’s not the most important issue

• Rather, the synthetic speech is still “buzzy”
  • It’s more likely to be excitation related

• Note: the Kaldi pitch tracker is a good choice too


LF automated parameter extraction

- LF opening phase is an exponential sinusoid

\[ \frac{dU_g(t)}{dt} = E(t) = E_0 e^{\alpha t} \sin(\omega_g t) \]

- This is the same as a second order system

\[ Y(s) = \frac{kX(s)}{ms^2 + cs + k} \]

\[ Y(s) = \frac{\omega_0^2 X(s)}{s^2 + 2\zeta\omega_0 s + \omega_0^2} \]

Two poles
Rough production model

- There is a minimum / maximum phase distinction
- Formants are inside the unit circle
- Excitation is outside the circle
  The glottal formant
- Usual (real) signal processing does not distinguish min/max phase
- ...but complex cepstrum does
Algorithm

• Calculate complex cepstrum
• Replace min-phase portion with max-phase portion
• Invert (one sided) cepstrum, auto-correlation, order two LP

  • See also: R. Maia et al. / Speech Communication 55 (2013)
Glottal formant

(180° is 1000 Hz)
Examples

• The file that I was using during development
  • EMIME sample
• Milos got some rather good results with a LibriVox voice
  • Luke original
  • Luke STRAIGHT
  • Luke glottal
Excitation conclusion

• A better excitation model can get rid of buzzy character
  • Key seems to be in low pass filtering the impulsive part
    This LPF is represented by the LF model
  • Only makes sense when added to noise
  • Currently has a few issues

• Automatic extraction is tricky
  Gives all but one parameter
  • Introduces other distortions
  • Defined as differential glottal flow
    Actual glottal flow would be better
Closing

• Conclusions
  • Pitch and HNR lead to a Kalman smoothed continuous pitch estimate
  • Vocoding without a voicing decision is easier than with
  • Glottal excitation is available from the complex cepstrum
  • Glottal modelling leads naturally to a maximum voiced frequency

• Corollaries
  • It’s all available open source in python
    https://github.com/idiap/ssp
  • Some in C++
    https://github.com/idiap/libssp