<span id="page-0-0"></span>

# **Postfiltering with Complex Spectral Correlations for Speech and Audio Coding**

#### **Sneha Das**<sup>1</sup> **and Tom Bäckström**<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Signal Processing and Acoustics, Aalto University, Finland*

**September, 2018**

## **Introduction**

- Speech signals→dominated by low-energy components (high frequencies).
- Encoding at low bitrates: Sparse signal (low-energy parts quantized to zero).
- Signal distorted, noise referred to as musical noise.
- Pre- and post-processing methods employed to mitigate this problem.
	- some need to be implemented both at encoder and decoder, thus modifying core codec structure.
	- some methods need to transmit additional side information.



## **Proposed method**

- Speech is slowly varying = high temporal correlation.
- Speech temporal and frequency correlation show noise-reduction potential.
- Speech codecs avoid transmitting information with temporal dependency; so not sufficiently studied.
- In this work, we propose:
	- a postfilter using speech models, applied at the decoder only to reduce quantization noise.
	- **Models incorporate the complex spectrum characteristics.**
	- **Postfilter optimal in MMSE sense.**



### **Quantized signal and Quantization noise Characteristics**



- Quantized signal is sparse  $\implies$  distribution shifts away from true signal distribution.
- Quantization noise highly correlated to the original signal.



### **Quantized signal and Quantization noise Dithering**



Randomization: type of dithering.

- Dithering preserves the quantized signal distribution.
- Also lends the quantization noise more uncorrelated characteristic.





### **Speech Modeling Context Neighborhood**

- Context: surrounding frequency bins.
- **a** (a) Context neighborhood of size  $l = 10$ .
- $\blacksquare$  (b) Recursive integration of context information , similar to IIR filtering.





**[Postfiltering with Complex Spectral Correlations for Speech and](#page-0-0) Audio Coding 6/15** September, 201[8](#page-0-0)

#### **Speech Modeling Problem Formulation**

- Signal model:  $Y_{k,t} = X_{k,t} + V_{k,t}$ .
- We assume speech, *X*, and noise, *V*, are zero-mean Gaussian random variables.
- We maximize the likelihood of the clean speech estimate,  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ , given the observation  $Y_{k,t}$  and the context  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_l$ , such that  $Y_{k,t} = \hat{X}_{k,t} + \hat{V}_{k,t}$  (constraint)

 $\blacksquare$  Thus, the Optimal Wiener filter

$$
\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \Lambda_X (\Lambda_X + \Lambda_N)^{-1} \mathbf{y}, \tag{1}
$$

 $\Lambda_X, \Lambda_N \in \mathbb{C}^{(L+1)\times(L+1)},$  *L*: context length.



**[Postfiltering with Complex Spectral Correlations for Speech and](#page-0-0) Audio Coding 7/15 Das, Bäckström September, 201[8](#page-0-0)** 

### **Speech Modeling Normalized covariance and gain modeling**

- Speech signals undergo large fluctuations in gain and spectral envelope structure.
- We remove the effect of this gain using normalization during offline modeling, to obtain the static speech covariance models, Λ*<sup>X</sup>* .
- The gain,  $\gamma$ , is computed during noise attenuation.
- Thus, the estimate of the current sample is obtained employing both  $\Lambda_X$  and  $\gamma,$   $\hat \Lambda_X = \gamma \Lambda_X,$   $\hat \Lambda_X$  is the dynamic covariance model.



## **Systems Overview**



**Figure:** Block diagram of the proposed system.



**[Postfiltering with Complex Spectral Correlations for Speech and](#page-0-0) Audio Coding 9/15** September, 201[8](#page-0-0)

### **Results Objective evaluation I**

#### Experimental setup

- Training:
	- 50 speech signals randomly chosen from TIMIT test dataset.
	- We resample the signals to 12.8 kHz and apply Sine window on frames of 20 ms with 50% overlap and transform to the frequency domain.
	- **Modeling applied in the perceptual domain.**
- Testing:
	- 105 speech samples randomly chosen and noisy signals generated by adding perceptually weighted noise to obtain signals in pSNR range 0-20 dB, 5 samples for each pSNR level.
	- We tested postfilters using context sizes from 1-14.
	- I Ideally enhanced signal (known noise energy) was used as reference.



#### **Results Objective evaluation II**

#### Evaluation results:





**[Postfiltering with Complex Spectral Correlations for Speech and](#page-0-0) Audio Coding 11/15** September, 201[8](#page-0-0)

#### **Results Subjective evaluation I**

Experimental setup

- **MUSHRA** test:
	- $\blacksquare$  Test comprised of 6 items and 8 test conditions.
	- Experts and non-experts in the age group 20-43 were included in the test.
	- 15 listeners (9 out of total 24 listeners were discarded after failure to identify hidden reference).



### **Results II Subjective evaluation I**

#### Test set:

- 6 random sentences from the TIMIT test dataset.
- Noisy sentences with additive perceptual noise at  $SNR=2$ , 5 and 8 dB..
- Male and female noisy cases were tested for each pSNR.
- Conditions: hidden reference, lower-anchor, noisy, ideal enhancement, conventional Wiener filter, proposed postfiltering with context sizes 1, 6, 14.



#### **Results Subjective evaluation II**



**Aalto University** 

**[Postfiltering with Complex Spectral Correlations for Speech and](#page-0-0) Audio Coding 14/15** September, 201[8](#page-0-0)

## **Conclusions**

- Presented a time-frequency filter for attenuation of quantization noise.
- The complex speech correlations are modeled offline and used at the decoder only, thus eliminating the chances of error propagation from transmission loss.
- Objective tests indicate an improvement of 6 dB in best-case scenario, and 2 dB in a typical application.
- Subjective results show an improvement of 10-30 MUSHRA points.

