

### **EVALITA 2009** Connected Digits Recognition Task

Gianpaolo Coro\*, Roberto Gretter°, Marco Matassoni°







# **Task Description**

In the Connected Digits Recognition Task, systems are required to recognize digits sequences uttered in a speech signal.

The task consists of two tracks:

•*Clean Speech Digit Sequence Recognition Task*: recognize digits sequences in **clean** speech environment.

•*Noisy Speech Digit Sequence Recognition Task:* recognize digits sequences in **noisy** speech environment. Noise may vary from white noise to traffic, room, etc.



# **Task Motivation**

Compare recognition systems focusing only on some components:

- small active dictionary:
  - reduce development time and training data collection and distribution.
  - almost independent from language model
- problems that can be found in more complex tasks
  - continuous speech
  - shared phonemes across words

*Connected digits sequences* automatic recognition focus more on acoustic models and feature representation, neglecting language model.



The corpus has been taken from various Italian acoustic corpora.

- Speakers are almost equally distributed along the territory
- Annotation at sentence level is provided
- Audio files are sampled at 16 kHz, 16 bit PCM, mono and stored in Windows .wav format
- Release of training, development and test sets



## Corpus Description 2/2

Clean Sets	Sentences	Speakers	# digits	Length
Train	3144	300	10129	~2h40m
Development	216	85	1629	~18m
Test	365	85	2360	~28m

Noisy Sets	Sentences	Speakers	# digits	Length
Train	2204	310	7376	~2h17m
Development	299	110	1940	~25m
Test	605	110	4036	~52m



Word Accuracy is defined as

$$WA = 100 - \frac{I + S + D}{N} \times 100$$

where, referring to the automatic transcription:

- I is the number of inserted words
- S is the number of substitutions
- D is the number of the deletions
- N is the number of words in the reference

Sentence Accuracy: is defined as

$$SA = \frac{H}{M} \times 100$$

Again, referring to the automatic transcription:

- H is the number of sentences correctly recognized
- M is the number of sentences in the reference

The evaluation is based on Minimum Edit Distance calculation between the transcription coming out from the recognizer and the orthographic annotation.





#### ABLA srl

#### CEDAT85

#### Istituto di Scienze e Tecnologie della Cognizione (ISTC-CNR)

#### University Federico II of Naples (only for Clean Speech Task)



### **Results in Clean Environment**

**EVALITA 2009 Workshop** Reggio Emilia, December 12, 2009

Sentence Acc %	Word Acc %	Words	Del+ Ins+ Sub	System		Description
96.44	99.45	2360	7+6+0	ISTC-SONIC_2		<ul> <li>HMM Acoustic Models</li> <li>Phonetic Approach</li> <li>PMVDR Features</li> <li>Decision-Tree State-Clustered HMMs</li> <li>Trained on Clean Data</li> </ul>
96.44	99.45	2360	8+3+2	ISTC-SONIC_1		<ul> <li>Structure as in ISTC-SONIC_2</li> <li>Trained on all the training data (Noisy + Clean)</li> </ul>
96.16	99.32	2360	4+8+4	ISTC-SPHINX_1		<ul> <li>HMM Acoustic Models</li> <li>Phonetic Approach</li> <li>MFCC Features</li> <li>Lexical Tree Search Structure</li> <li>Trained on all the training data (Noisy + Clean)</li> </ul>
95.89	99.28	2360	6+2+9	ABLA-NUANCE	Т	<ul> <li>HMM Acoustic Models</li> <li>Phonetic Approach</li> <li>MFCC Features</li> <li>Word Graphs Decoding</li> <li>Big Training Data Set</li> </ul>
95.62	99.19	2360	6+5+8	ISTC-CSLU_1		<ul> <li>HMM + ANN Acoustic Models</li> <li>Phonetic Approach</li> <li>MFCC+PLP Features</li> <li>Trained on all the training data (Noisy + Clean)</li> </ul>
94.25	98.94	2360	11+7+7	ISTC-CSLU_2		<ul> <li>Structure as in ISTC-CSLU_1</li> <li>Trained on Clean Data</li> </ul>
93.70	98.77	2360	6+14+9	ISTC-SPHINX_2		<ul> <li>Structure as in ISTC-SPHINX_1</li> <li>Trained on Clean Data</li> </ul>
89.59	98.05	2360	5+19+22	CEDAT85 (Based on IBM VoiceTaylor)	Т	<ul> <li>HMM Acoustic Models</li> <li>Phonetic Approach</li> <li>Big Training Data Set in Clean Env.</li> </ul>
81.64	96.06	2360	34+3+56	ABLA-TSPEECH	Т	<ul> <li>HMM Acoustic Models</li> <li>Syllabic Dynamic Approach</li> <li>Energy and Duration Templates</li> <li>Small Training Data Set (2000 words) in Clean Env.</li> </ul>
18.36	77.84	2360	116+104+303	UNINA	L	<ul> <li>SVM Unity Classification</li> <li>Automatic Syllabic Segmentation</li> <li>Unit Graph Decoding</li> <li>Trained on Clean Data</li> </ul>



### **Results in Noisy Environment**

**EVALITA 2009 Workshop** Reggio Emilia, December 12, 2009

Sentence Acc %	Word Acc %	Words	Del+ Ins+ Sub	System		Description
87.77	96.21	4036	104+13+36	ISTC-SONIC_2		<ul> <li>HMM Acoustic Models</li> <li>Phonetic Approach</li> <li>PMVDR Features</li> <li>Decision-Tree State-Clustered HMMs</li> <li>Trained on Noisy Data</li> </ul>
86.45	95.91	4036	105+11+49	ISTC-SONIC_1		<ul> <li>Structure as in ISTC-SONIC_2</li> <li>Trained on all the training data (Noisy + Clean)</li> </ul>
81.82	93.95	4036	121+29+94	ISTC-CSLU_2		<ul> <li>HMM + ANN Acoustic Models</li> <li>Phonetic Approach</li> <li>MFCC+PLP Features</li> <li>Trained on Noisy Data</li> </ul>
79.17	93.06	4036	136+51+93	ISTC-SPHINX_1		<ul> <li>HMM Acoustic Models</li> <li>Phonetic Approach</li> <li>MFCC Features</li> <li>Lexical Tree Search Structure</li> <li>Trained on all the training data (Noisy + Clean)</li> </ul>
81.65	92.42	4036	135+37+134	ISTC-CSLU_1		<ul> <li>Structure as in ISTC-CSLU_2</li> <li>Trained on all the training data (Noisy + Clean)</li> </ul>
72.56	91.63	4036	133+81+124	ISTC-SPHINX_2		<ul> <li>Structure as in ISTC-SPHINX_1</li> <li>Trained on Noisy Data</li> </ul>
78.02	91.03	4036	255+36+71	CEDAT85 (Based on IBM VoiceTaylor)	Т	<ul> <li>HMM Acoustic Models</li> <li>Phonetic Approach</li> <li>Big Training Data Set in Clean Env.</li> </ul>
77.69	88.65	4036	268+26+164	ABLA-NUANCE	Т	<ul> <li>HMM Acoustic Models</li> <li>Phonetic Approach</li> <li>MFCC Features</li> <li>Word Graphs Decoding</li> <li>Big Training Data Set</li> </ul>
69.09	82.23	4036	467+56+194	ABLA-TSPEECH	Т	<ul> <li>HMM Acoustic Models</li> <li>Syllabic Dynamic Approach</li> <li>Energy and Duration Templates</li> <li>Small Training Data Set (2000 words) in Clean Env.</li> </ul>



Little mismatch between training and test data:

• very effective acoustic model

Open discussion about the effectiveness of various approaches to speech recognition:

- syllabic versus phonetic modelling
- choice of suitable acoustic features