Robustness - Things Change

- Background noise can increase or decrease
- Channel can change
  - Different microphone
  - Microphone placement
- Speaker characteristics vary
  - Different glottal waveforms
  - Different vocal tract lengths
  - Different speaking rates
- Heaven knows what else can happen

Robustness Strategies

Basic Acoustic Model: \( P(O|W, \theta) \)

- **Robust features**: Features \( O \) that are independent of noise, channel, speaker, etc. so \( \theta \) does not have to be modified.
  - More an art than a science but requires little/no data
- **Noise Modeling**: Explicit models for the effect background noise has on speech recognition parameters \( \theta' = f(\theta, N) \)
  - Works well when model fits, requires less data
- **Adaptation**: Update estimate of \( \theta \) from new observations
  - Very powerful but often requires the most data \( \theta' = f(N, p(O|W, \theta)) \)
Robustness Outline

- General Adaptation Issues - Training and Retraining
- Features
  - PLP
- Robust Features
  - Cepstral Mean Removal
  - Spectral Subtraction
  - Codeword Dependent Cepstral Normalization (CDCN) - Noise Modeling
  - Parallel Model Combination
  - Some comparisons of various noise immunity schemes
- Adaptation
  - Maximum A Posteriori (MAP) Adaptation
  - Maximum Likelihood Linear Regression (MLLR)
  - feature-based MLLR (fMLLR)

Adaptation - General Retraining

- If the environment changes, retrain system from scratch in new environment
  - Very expensive - cannot collect hundreds of hours of data for each new environment
- Two strategies
  - Environment simulation
  - Multistyle Training

Adaptation - General Training Issues

Most systems today require > 200 hours of speech from > 200 speakers to train robustly for a new domain.
**Multistyle Training**

- Take training data
- Corrupt/transform training data in various representative fashions
- Collect training data in a variety of representative environments
- Pool all such data together; retrain system

---

**Cepstral Mean Normalization**

We can model a large class of environmental distortions as a simple linear filter:

\[ \hat{y}[n] = \hat{x}[n] \ast \hat{h}[n] \]

where \( \hat{h}[n] \) is our linear filter and \( \ast \) denotes convolution (Lecture 1). In the frequency domain we can write

\[ \hat{Y}(k) = \hat{X}(k) \hat{H}(k) \]

Taking the logarithms of the amplitudes:

\[ \log \hat{Y}(k) = \log \hat{X}(k) + \log \hat{H}(k) \]

that is, the effect of the linear distortion is to add a constant vector to the amplitudes in the log domain.

Now if we examine our normal cepstral processing, we can write this as the following processing sequence.

\[ O[k] = \text{Cepst}(\log \text{Bin}(\text{FFT}(\hat{x}[n] \ast \hat{h}(n)))) \]
\[ = \text{Cepst}(\log \text{Bin}(\hat{X}(k) \hat{H}(k))) \]

We can essentially ignore the effects of binning. Since the mapping from mel-spectra to mel cepstra is linear, from the above, we can essentially model the effect of linear filtering as just adding a constant vector in the cepstral domain:

\[ O'[k] = O[k] + h[k] \]

so robustness can be achieved by estimating \( h[k] \) and subtracting it from the observed \( O'[k] \).

---

**Issues with System Retraining**

- Simplistic models of noise and channel
  - e.g. telephony degradations more than just a decrease in bandwidth
- Hard to anticipate every possibility
  - In high noise environment, person speaks louder with resultant effects on glottal waveform, speed, etc.
- System performance in clean environment can be degraded.
- Retraining system for each environment is very expensive
- Therefore other schemes - noise modeling and general forms of adaptation - are needed and sometimes used in tandem with these other schemes.
Cepstral Mean Normalization - Estimation

Given a set of cepstral vectors $O_t$ we can compute the mean:

$$\bar{O} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^{N} O_t$$

“Cepstral mean normalization” produces a new output vector $\hat{O}_t$

$$\hat{O}_t = O_t - \bar{O}$$

Say the signal corresponding to $O_t$ is processed by a linear filter. Say $h$ is a cepstral vector corresponding to such a linear filter. In such a case, the output after linear filtering will be

$$y_t = O_t + h$$

The mean of $y_t$ is

$$\bar{y} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^{N} y_t = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^{N} (O_t + h) = \bar{O} + h$$

so after “Cepstral Mean Normalization”

$$\hat{y}_t = y_t - \bar{y} = \hat{O}_t$$

That is, the influence of $h$ has been eliminated.

Cepstral Mean Normalization - Issues

- Error rates for utterances even in the same environment improves (Why?)
- Must be performed on both training and test data.
- Bad things happen if utterances are very short (Why?)
- Bad things happen if there is a lot of variable length silence in the utterance (Why?)
- Cannot be used in a real time system (Why?)

Cepstral Mean Normalization - Real Time Implementation

Can estimate mean dynamically as

$$\bar{O}_t = \alpha O_t + (1 - \alpha)\bar{O}_{t-1}$$

In real-life applications, it is useful run a silence detector in parallel and turn adaptation off (set $\alpha$ to zero) when silence is detected, hence:

$$\bar{O}_t = \alpha(s)O_t + (1 - \alpha(s))\bar{O}_{t-1}$$
spectrum in the mel filter computation, it is also reasonable to assume the net contribution of the cross terms will be zero.

In such a case we can write

\[ |Y[k]|^2 = |X[k]|^2 + |N[k]|^2 \]

Cepstral Mean Normalization - Typical Results


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CLOSE</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BASE</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMN</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task is 5000-word WSJ LVCSR

Spectral Subtraction - Background

Another common type of distortion is additive noise. In such a case, we may write

\[ y[i] = x[i] + n[i] \]

where \( n[i] \) is some noise signal. Since we are dealing with linear operations, we can write in the frequency domain

\[ Y[k] = X[k] + N[k] \]

The power spectrum (Lecture 1) is therefore

\[ |Y[k]|^2 = |X[k]|^2 + |N[k]|^2 + X[k]N^*[k] + X^*[k]N[k] \]

If we assume \( n[i] \) is zero mean and uncorrelated with \( x[i] \), the last two terms on the average would also be zero. By the time we window the signal and also bin the resultant amplitudes of the spectrum in the mel filter computation, it is also reasonable to assume the net contribution of the cross terms will be zero.

In such a case we can write

\[ |Y[k]|^2 = |X[k]|^2 + |N[k]|^2 \]

Spectral Subtraction - Basic Idea

In such a case, it is reasonable to estimate \( |X[k]|^2 \) as:

\[ |\hat{X}[k]|^2 = |Y[k]|^2 - |\hat{N}[k]|^2 \]

where \( |\hat{N}[k]|^2 \) is some estimate of the noise. One way to estimate this is to average \( |Y[k]|^2 \) over a sequence of frames known to be silence (by using a silence detection scheme):

\[ |\hat{N}[k]|^2 = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{t=0}^{M-1} |Y_t[k]|^2 \]

Note that \( Y[k] \) here can either be the FFT output (when trying to actually reconstruct the original signal) or, in speech recognition, the output of the FFT after Mel binning.
Spectral Subtraction - Issues

The main issue with Spectral Subtraction is that $|\hat{N}[k]|^2$ is only an estimate of the noise, not the actual noise value itself. In a given frame, $|Y[k]|^2$ may be less than $|\hat{N}[k]|^2$. In such a case, $|\hat{X}[k]|^2$ would be negative, wreaking havoc when we take the logarithm of the amplitude when computing the mel-cepstra.

The standard solution to this problem is just to “floor” the estimate of $|\hat{X}[k]|^2$:

$$|\hat{X}[k]|^2 = \max(|Y[k]|^2 - |\hat{N}[k]|^2, \beta)$$

where $\beta$ is some appropriately chosen constant.

Given that for any realistic signal, the actual $|X(k)|^2$ has some amount of background noise, we can estimate this noise during training similarly to how we estimate $|N(k)|^2$. Call this estimate $N_{\text{train}}[k]$. In such a case our estimate for $|X(k)|^2$ becomes

$$|\hat{X}[k]|^2 = \max(|Y[k]|^2 - |\hat{N}[k]|^2, N_{\text{train}}[k]^2)$$

Even with this noise flooring, because of the variance of the noise process, little “spikes” come through generating discontinuities in time in low-noise regions with disastrous effects on recognition. To deal with this, sometimes “oversubtraction” is used:

$$|\hat{X}[k]|^2 = \max(|Y[k]|^2 - \alpha|\hat{N}[k]|^2, N_{\text{train}}[k]^2)$$

where $\alpha$ is some constant chosen to minimize the noise spikes when there is no speech.

Combined Noise and Channel Degradations

Spectral subtraction assumes degradation due to additive noise and Cepstral Mean Removal assumes degradation due to multiplicative noise. Combining both, we get

$$Y = HX + N$$

or taking logarithms

$$\ln Y = \ln X + \ln H + \ln(1 + \frac{N}{HX})$$

switching to the log domain we get

$$y^l = x^l + h^l + \ln(1 + e^{x^l-x^l-h^l})$$

or using the notation $y = Cy^l$ to move to the cepstral domain we
get

\[ y = x + h + C \ln(1 + e^{C^{-1}(n-x-h)}) = x + h + r(x,n,h) \]

or

\[ x = y - h - r(x,n,h) \]

So, this is not an easy expression to work with. What do we do?

\[ \hat{x} = E(x|y) = \int xp(x|y)dx \]

Spectral subtraction can be shown to be a special case of MMSE with a set of restrictive assumptions. In general, a goal of MMSE modeling is to look for relatively simple functional forms for \( p(x|y) \) so that a closed form expression for \( \hat{x} \) in terms of \( y \) can be found.

\[ \text{Generalization: Minimum Mean Square Error Estimation} \]

Assume the vector \( y \) is some corrupted version of the vector \( x \). We get to observe \( y \) and wish to devise an estimate for \( x \). It would appear that a reasonable property would be to find some estimate \( \hat{x} \) such that the average value of \( (x-\hat{x})^2 \) is minimized. It can easily be shown that the best estimator \( \hat{x} \) in such a case is just:

\[ \hat{x} = E(x|y) = \int xp(x|y)dx \]

\[ \text{Modeling } p(x|y) \text{ via Gaussian Mixtures} \]

Now

\[ p(x|y) = p(y,x)/p(y) \]

Let us model \( p(x, y) \) as a function of a sum of \( K \) distributions:

\[ p(x, y) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} p(x, y|k)p(k) \]

Let us write

\[ p(x, y|k) = p(y|x, k)q(x|k) \]

where

\[ q(x|k) = \frac{1}{K \sqrt{2\pi \sigma}} e^{-\frac{(x-\mu_k)^2}{2\sigma^2}} \]

From above, our noise model is

\[ x = y - h - r(x,n,h) \]

which is equivalent to saying

\[ p(y|x, k) = \delta(x - (y - h - r(x,n,h))) \]

where \( \delta(t) \) is a delta (impulse) function
**Estimation Equations**

We now may write the estimate for $x$ as

\[
\hat{x} = \int \frac{xp(x, y)}{\sum_{l=1}^{K} q(y - h - r[l]|l)} dx
\]

\[
= \int \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{K} \delta(x - (y - h - r[k]))q(x|k)}{\sum_{l=1}^{K} q(y - h - r[l]|l)} dx
\]

\[
= \sum_{k=1}^{K} \frac{(y - h - r[k])q(y - h - r[k]|k)}{\sum_{l=1}^{K} q(y - h - r[l]|l)}
\]

Note the term involving $q$ is just the mixture of gaussian posterior probability we saw in Lecture 3. Iterative equations for estimating $h$ and $n$ can also be developed; refer to the reading for more information.

**Vector Taylor Series** is a CDCN variant in which $r$ is approximated as a linearized function with respect to $x$ and $\mu_k$ rather than assumed constant.

**Algonquin** is a more sophisticated CDCN variant in which $p(y|x, k)$ is assumed to have an actual probability distribution (e.g., Normal) to model noise phase uncertainty.
CDCN Performance

From Alex Acero’s PhD Thesis “Acoustical and Environmental Robustness in Automatic Speech Recognition” CMU (1990):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRAIN/TEST</th>
<th>CLS/CLS</th>
<th>CLS/PZM</th>
<th>PZM/CLS</th>
<th>PZM/PZM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BASE</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMR</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSUB</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSUB</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDCN</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Error rates for a SI alphanumeric task recorded on two different microphones.

Additional Performance Figures

Parallel Model Combination - Basic Idea

Idea: Incorporate model of noise directly into our GMM-based HMMs.

If our observations were just the FFT outputs this would be straightforward. In such a case, the corrupted version of our signal \( x \) with noise \( n \) is just:

\[
y = x + n
\]

If \( x \sim N(\mu_x, \sigma^2_x) \) and \( n \sim N(\mu_n, \sigma^2_n) \) then \( y \sim N(\mu_x + \mu_n, \sigma^2_x + \sigma^2_n) \)

But our observations are cepstral parameters - extremely nonlinear transformations of the space in which the noise is additive. What do we do?
Parallel Model Combination - One Dimensional Case

Let us make a Very Simple approximation to Cepstral parameters: \( X = \ln x, N = \ln n \).

Pretend we are modeling these “cepstral” parameters with “HMMs” in the form of univariate Gaussians. In such a case, let us say \( X \sim N(\mu_X, \sigma_X^2) \) and \( N \sim N(\mu_N, \sigma_N^2) \). We can then write:

\[
Y = \ln(e^X + e^N)
\]

What is the probability distribution of \( Y \)?
Parallel Model Combination - Actual Cepstra

Remember that the mel-cepstra are computed from mel-spectra by the following formula:

\[ c[n] = \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} X[m] \cos(\pi n (m - 1/2) / M) \]

We can view this as just a matrix multiplication:

\[ c = Cx \]

where \( x \) is just the vector of the \( x[m] \)s and the components of matrix \( C \) are

\[ C_{ij} = \cos(\pi j(i - 1/2) / M) \]

In such a case, the mean and covariance matrix in the mel-spectral domain can be computed as

\[
\mu_x = C^{-1} \mu_c \\
\Sigma_x = C^{-1} \Sigma_c (C^{-1})^T
\]

and similarly for the noise cepstra.

Unfortunately, although the sum of two Gaussian variables is a Gaussian, the sum of two lognormal variables is not lognormal.

As good engineers, we will promptly ignore this fact and act as if \( y \) DOES have a lognormal distribution (!). In such a case, \( Y = \ln y \) is Gaussian and the mean and variance are given by:

\[
\mu_Y = \ln \mu_y - \frac{1}{2} \ln \left[ \frac{\sigma_y^2}{\mu_y^2} + 1 \right] \\
\sigma_Y^2 = \ln \left[ \frac{\sigma_y^2}{\mu_y^2} + 1 \right]
\]

If \( x \) and \( n \) are uncorrelated, we can write:

\[
\mu_y = \mu_x + \mu_n \\
\sigma_y^2 = \sigma_x^2 + \sigma_n^2
\]
Maximum A Posteriori Parameter Estimation - Basic Idea

Another way to achieve robustness is to take a fully trained HMM system, a small amount of data from a new domain, and combine the information from the old and new systems together. To put everything on a sound framework, we will utilize the parameters of the fully-trained HMM system as prior information.

In Maximum Likelihood Estimation (Lecture 3) we try to pick a set of parameters $\hat{\theta}$ that maximize the likelihood of the data:

$$\hat{\theta} = \arg \max_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(O_1^N | \theta)$$

In Maximum A Posterior Estimation we assume there is some prior probability distribution on $\theta$, $p(\theta)$ and we try to pick $\hat{\theta}$ to maximize the a posteriori probability of $\theta$ given the observations:

$$\hat{\theta} = \arg \max_{\theta} p(\theta | O_1^N)$$

$$= \arg \max_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(O_1^N | \theta)p(\theta)$$

Although comparisons seem to be rare, when PMC is compared to schemes such as VTS, VTS seems to have proved somewhat superior in performance. However, the basic concepts of PMC have been recently combined with EM-like estimation schemes to significantly enhance performance (more later).
Maximum A Posteriori Parameter Estimation - Conjugate Priors

What form should we use for \( p(\theta) \)? To simplify later calculations, we try to use an expression so that \( \mathcal{L}(O^N|\theta)p(\theta) \) has the same functional form as \( \mathcal{L}(O^N|\theta) \). This type of form for the prior is called a conjugate prior.

In the case of a univariate Gaussian we are trying to estimate \( \mu \) and \( \sigma \). Let \( r = 1/\sigma^2 \). An appropriate conjugate prior is:

\[
p(\theta) = p(\mu, r) \propto r^{(\alpha-1)/2}\exp\left(-\frac{\tau r}{2}(\mu - \mu_p)^2\right)\exp\left(-\frac{\sigma_p^2 r}{2}\right)
\]

where \( \mu_p \) and \( \sigma_p^2 \) are prior estimates/knowledge of the mean and variance from some initial set of training data. Note how ugly the functional forms get even for a relatively simple case!

Maximum A Posteriori Parameter Estimation - General HMM Case

Through a set of similar manipulations, we can move generalize the previous formula to the HMM case. As before, \( c_{ik} \) is the mixture weight \( k \) for state \( i \), \( \nu_{ik}, \mu_{ik}, \Sigma_{ik} \) are the prior estimates for the mixture weight, mean and covariance matrix of mixture component \( k \) for state \( i \) from a previously trained HMM system. In this case:

\[
\hat{c}_{ik} = \frac{\nu_{ik} - 1 + \sum_t C_t(i,k)}{\sum_l (\nu_{il} - 1 + \sum_t C_t(i,l))}
\]

\[
\hat{\mu}_{ik} = \frac{\tau_{ik} \mu_{ik} + \sum_{t=1}^N C_t(i,k)O_t}{\sum_t (\tau_{ik} + \sum_t C_t(i,l))}
\]

Both \( \tau \) and \( \alpha \) are balancing parameters that can be tuned to optimize performance on different test domains. In practice, a single \( \tau \) is adequate across all states and Gaussians, and variance adaptation rarely has been successful, at least in speech recognition, to improve performance. We will save discussions of MAP performance on adaptation until the end of the MLLR section, which is next.

Maximum A Posteriori Parameter Estimation - Univariate Gaussian Case

Without torturing you with the math, we can plug in the conjugate prior expression and compute \( \mu \) and \( r \) to maximize the a posteriori probability. We get

\[
\hat{\mu} = \frac{N}{N + \tau} \mu_O + \frac{\tau}{N + \tau} \mu_p
\]

where \( \mu_O \) is the mean of the data computed using the ML procedure.

\[
\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{N}{N + \alpha - 1} \sigma_O^2 + \frac{\tau (\mu_O - \hat{\mu})^2 + \sigma_p^2}{N + \alpha - 1}
\]
Taking derivatives with respect to \( w \) we get

\[
\sum_{t=1}^{N} 2x_t (O_t - x_t^T w) = 0
\]

so collecting terms we get

\[
w = \left[ \sum_{t=1}^{N} x_t x_t^T \right]^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^{N} x_t O_t
\]

In MLLR, the \( x \) values will turn out to correspond to the means of the Gaussians.

**Maximum Likelihood Linear Regression - Basic Idea**

In MAP, the different HMM Gaussians are free to move in any direction. In Maximum Likelihood Linear Regression the means of the Gaussians are constrained to only move according to an affine transformation \((Ax + b)\).

**Simple Linear Regression - Review**

Say we have a set of points \((x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), \ldots, (x_N, y_N)\) and we want to find coefficients \(a, b\) so that

\[
\sum_{t=1}^{N} (O_t - (ax_t + b))^2
\]

is minimized. Define \( w \) to be the column vector consisting of \((a, b)\), and the column vector \( x_t \) corresponding to \((x_t, 1)\). We can then write the above set of equations as

\[
\sum_{t=1}^{N} (O_t - x_t^T w)^2
\]
we can iterate to find a \( w \) that maximizes \( p_w(O_1^N) \) or equivalently \( L(O_1^N) \)

\[
L(O_1^N) = \sum_{t=1}^{N} \ln \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{K} \frac{p_k}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_k}} e^{- \frac{(O_t - \mu_k^T w)^2}{2\sigma_k^2}} \right]
\]

To maximize the likelihood of this expression we utilize the E-M algorithm we have briefly alluded to in our discussion of the Forward-Backward (aka Baum-Welch) algorithm.

**E-M Review**

The E-M Theorem states that if

\[
Q(w, w') = \sum_x p_w(X_1^N | O_1^N) \ln p_{w'}(X_1^N, O_1^N)
\]

\[
> \sum_x p_w(X_1^N | O_1^N) \ln p_w(X_1^N, O_1^N)
\]

then

\[
p_{w'}(O_1^N) > p_w(O_1^N)
\]

Therefore if we can find

\[
\hat{w}' = \arg \max_{w'} Q(w, w')
\]

**E-M for MLLR**

For a Gaussian mixture, it can be shown that

\[
Q(w, w') = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{t=1}^{N} C_t(k) \ln p_k
\]

\[
- \ln \sqrt{2\pi\sigma_k} - (O_t - \mu_k^T w')^2 / 2\sigma_k^2
\]

where

\[
C_t(k) = p_w(k | O) = \frac{p_k}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_k}} e^{- \frac{(O_t - \mu_k^T w)^2}{2\sigma_k^2}}
\]

\[
\sum_{l=1}^{K} p_l \sqrt{2\pi\sigma_l} e^{- \frac{(O_t - \mu_l^T w)^2}{2\sigma_l^2}}
\]

We can maximize \( Q(w, w') \) by computing its derivative and...
MLLR - Multiple Transforms

A single MLLR transform for all of speech is very restrictive. Multiple transforms can be created by grouping HMM states into larger classes, for example, at the phone level. Sometimes these classes can be arranged hierarchically, in the form of a tree. The number of speech frames at each node in the tree is examined, and if there are enough frames at a node, a separate transform is estimated for all the phones at the node.

MLLR - Additional Considerations

Since the typical parameter vector being processed is 39 dimensional (13 cepstral parameters, and the associated deltas and double-deltas) the number of matrix parameters to be estimated is roughly 1600. As a rule of thumb, if one frame of data gives you enough information to estimate one parameter, then we need at least 16 seconds of speech to estimate a full 39x39 MLLR matrix.

setting it equal to zero:

$$\sum_{t=1}^{N} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{K} C_t(k) \frac{\mu_k}{\sigma_k^2} (O_t - \mu_k^T w') \right]$$

Setting to zero and collecting terms we get

$$\sum_{t=1}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{K} C_t(k) \frac{\mu_k \mu_k^T}{\sigma_k^2} w' = \sum_{t=1}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{K} C_t(k) \frac{\mu_k}{\sigma_k^2} O_t$$

Define $C(k) = \sum_t C_t(k)$ and $\bar{O}(k) = \frac{1}{C(k)} \sum_t C_t(k) O_t$, we can rewrite the above as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \sum_{k=1}^{K} C(k) \frac{\mu_k \mu_k^T}{\sigma_k^2} \end{bmatrix} w' = \sum_{k=1}^{K} C(k) \frac{\mu_k}{\sigma_k^2} \bar{O}(k)$$

so we may compute $w'$ as just:

$$w' = \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{K} C(k) \frac{\mu_k \mu_k^T}{\sigma_k^2} \right]^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{K} C(k) \frac{\mu_k}{\sigma_k^2} \bar{O}(k)$$

compare to the expression for simple linear regression:

$$w = \left[ \sum_{t=1}^{N} x_t x_t^T \right]^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^{N} x_t O_t$$

In actual speech recognition systems, the observations are vectors, not scalars, so the transform to be estimated is of the form

$$A \mu + b$$

where $A$ is a matrix and $b$ is a vector. The resultant MLLR equations are somewhat more complex but follow the same basic form. We refer you to the readings for the details.
The primary advantage is that the likelihood computation can be written as purely as a transformation to the input features so if solvable it is very easy to implement.

**Feature Based MLLR**

Let’s say we now want to transform all the means by

\[ \mu_k / a - b / a \]

and the variances by

\[ \sigma_k^2 / \alpha^2 \]

Define \( O_t \) as the augmented column observation vector \((O_t, 1)\), \( w = (a, b)^T \) as above, and \( r = (1, 0)^T \) We can therefore write

\[
Q(w, w') = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{t=1}^{N} C_t(k) [\ln p_k - \ln \sqrt{2\pi \sigma_k} + \ln r^T w' - (O_t^T w' - \mu_k)^2 / 2\sigma_k^2]
\]

with \( C_t(k) \) defined similarly as in the MLLR discussion.

**Solving fMLLR**

If we take the derivative, we now get

\[
\sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{t=1}^{N} C_t(k) [r / r^T w' - O_t (O_t^T w' - \mu_k)^2 / 2\sigma_k^2]
\]

which can be rewritten as

\[
\beta r / r^T w' - \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{K} 1 / \sigma_k^2 \sum_{t=1}^{T} C_t(k) O_t O_t^T \right] w' + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \mu_k / \sigma_k^2 \sum_{t=1}^{T} C_t(k) O_t
\]

or

\[
\beta r / r^T w' - G w' + s = 0
\]

collecting terms we can rewrite this as

\[
w' = G^{-1} (\beta / r^T w' + s)
\]
if we premultiply by $r^T$ we get

$$r^T w' = r^T G^{-1}(\beta/r^T w' + s)$$

let $\alpha = r^T w'$ then we can write

$$\alpha = r^T G^{-1}(\beta/\alpha + s)$$

one can then solve for $\alpha$ and $w'$ and pick the value of $\alpha$ that maximizes $Q(w, w')$ The details on how to do this for the vector observations are given in the paper in the readings ("Maximum Likelihood Linear Transformations for HMM-Based Speech Recognition", Mark Gales, Computer Speech and Language 1998 Volume 12).

Performance of MLLR and fMLLR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Test1</th>
<th>Test2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BASE</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>9.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLLR</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>8.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fMLLR</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>7.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>7.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task is Broadcast News with a 65K vocabulary.

SAT refers to “Speaker Adaptive Training”. In SAT, a transform is computed for each speaker during test and training; it is a very common training technique in ASR today.

MLLR and MAP - Performance

![Figure 9.11](image)

**Figure 9.11** Comparison of Whisper with MLLR, MAP, and combined MLLR and MAP. The error rate is shown for a different amount of adaptation data. The speaker-dependent and speaker-independent models are also included. The speaker-dependent model was trained with 1000 sentences.

MLLR - Comments on Noise Immunity Performance

Last but not least, one can also apply MLLR and fMLLR as a noise compensation scheme in “HIGH-PERFORMANCE HMM ADAPTATION WITH JOINT COMPENSATION OF ADDITIVE AND CONVOLUTIVE DISTORTIONS VIA VECTOR TAYLOR SERIES Jinyu Li¹, Li Deng, Dong Yu, Yifan Gong, and Alex Acero” presented at ASRU 2007 in Japan, it is claimed that MLLR/fMLLR alone is inferior to schemes that use the E-M algorithm to directly estimate PMC-like noise compensation model based parameters at very low SNRs but comprehensive comparisons across all SNRs were not provided.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE FEEDBACK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Was this lecture mostly clear or unclear? What was the muddiest topic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other feedback (pace, content, atmosphere)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>