### Waveform Generation

From phones, durations, F0 to waveforms

# Types of synthesis

Articulartory: model the human vocal tract
Formant: model the voice signal
Concatenative: diphones, unit selection
Statistical Parametric Synthesis
Canned speech

## Waveform generation

- $\square$  Formant synthesis
- $\square$  Random word/phrase concatenation
- $\square$  Phone concatenation
- $\square$  Diphone concatenation
- $\square$  Sub-word unit selection
- $\square$  Cluster based unit selection
- $\square$  Clustergen SPS synthesis

### Concatenative synthesis

 $\square$  Select appropriate speech unit

 $\Box$  Impose desired prosody

 $\square$  Reconstruct signal from modifed parts

Quality is usually good, but less flexible than formant or articulatory.

## Diphone synthesis

 $\square$  mid-phone is more stable than edge

 $\square$  Need phone<sup>2</sup> number of units:

- some combinations don't exist (hopefully)
- may include stress, consonant clusters
- lots of phonetic knowledge in design

 $\square$  Database relatively small (by today's standards)

- around 8 meg for English (16KHz 16bit)

## Designing a diphone inventory

Nonsense words

 $\Box$  Build set of carrier words:

– pau t aa b aa b aa pau

– pau t aa m aa m aa pau

– pau t aa m iy m aa pau

– pau t aa m ih m aa pau

 $\Box$  Advantages:

– easy to get all diphones

- will be pronounced consistently

- (no lexical interferance)

 $\square$  Disadvantages:

– (possibly) bigger db

- will be pronounced consistently

- (speaker becomes bored)

As we will be randomly joining these units consistency is probably key

# Designing a diphone inventory

Natural words

 $\square$  Greedily select sentences/words:

- quebecois arguments (19)

- brouhaha abstractions (18)
- arkansas arranging (11)

 $\Box$  Advantages:

- will be pronounced naturally
- easier for speaker to pronounce
- smaller db? (505 pairs vs 1345 words)

 $\square$  Disadvantages:

- will be pronounced naturally
- may not be pronounced correctly

Diphone distribution in natural text is very variable

# Making recordings consistent

Natural words

 $\square$  Diphone should come from mid-word

– help ensure full articulation

 $\square$  Performed consistently

– constant pitch, power, duration

 $\Box$  Use (synthesized) prompts:

- help avoid pronunciation problems
- keep speaker consistent
- used for alignment in labelling

# Building diphone schema

 $\Box$  Find list of phones in language:

- plus interesting allophones
- stress, tones, clusters, onset/coda etc
- foreign (rare) phones,

 $\Box$  Build carriers for:

- consonant-vowel, vowel-consonant,
- $\ vowel-vowel, \ consonant-consonant,$
- silence-phone, phone-silence,
- other special cases

 $\Box$  Check the output:

- list *all* diphones and justify missing ones
- every diphone list has mistakes

# **Recording conditions**

 $\Box$  Ideal:

- anechoic chamber
- studio quality recording
- EGG signal

 $\Box$  What we put up with:

- quiet room
- cheap microphone/sound blaster
- no EGG
- headmounted microphone
- $\Box$  What we can do
  - repeatable conditions
  - careful setting on audio levels

# Labelling Diphones

 $\Box$  Much easier than phonetic labelling:

- the phone sequence is defined
- they are clearly articulated
- if its wrong, its wrong
- $\square$  Phone boundaries less important
  - + /- 10 ms is okay.
- $\square$  Midphone boundaries important
  - where is the stable part
  - can it be automatically found

#### **Dynamic Time Warping**

Find shortest euclidean distance through table



## Simple autoalignment

Much easier than full autolabelling

 $\square$  Synthesizer phone string

 $\square$  Time align prompt to spoken form

– using euclidean distance

 $\Box$  Works very well 95%+

- errors are typically large (easy to fix)

– maybe even automatically detected

 $\Box$  This works cross-language too:

– even when phones don't exist

– e.g. English prompts with Korean spoken form

Malfrere and Dutoit 97

# Diphone alignment

Does it work?

 $\Box$  DP align MFCC prompt to spoken word

 $\Box$  test against hand labelled

|         | type   | RMSE    | stddev |
|---------|--------|---------|--------|
| KED-KED | self   | 14.77ms | 17.08  |
| MWM-KED | US-US  | 27.23ms | 28.95  |
| GSW-KED | UK-US  | 25.25ms | 23.92  |
| KED-WHY | US-Kor | 28.34ms | 27.52  |

### Stable part in phones

 $\Box$  Middle of phone:

- one third in for stops
- one quarter in for phone-silence
- half way for rest

 $\Box$  In time alignment case:

- Add explicit diphone boundaries
- (only need to hand correct once)
- $\Box$  Optimal coupling (Conkie and Isard 96)
  - automatically find them
  - using Euclidean distance of cepstrum
  - find minimum join point over all phone-phone
  - or find best for each phone-phone

 $\Box$  Hand check each one:

– what "real" companies do





# Autolabelling vs Hand labelling

Recorded KAL (US male)
around 15-20 examples wrong (KED-KAL)
As good as first pass by human labellers
45 mins vs 2 weeks hand labelling
Whole voice in under 2 days
recording 3-4 hours
pitch mark extraction 3 hours
alignment 1 hour
hand correction and tuning (3 hours)