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Abstract: An Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR) System is a software tool that converts a speech audio waveform into its corresponding text transcription. ASR systems are usually built using Artificial Intelligence techniques, particularly Machine Learning algorithms like Deep Learning, to address the multi-faceted complexity and variability of human speech. This allows these systems to learn from extensive speech datasets, adapt to several languages and accents, and continuously improve their performance over time, making them each time more versatile and effective in their purpose of transcribing spoken language to text. Much in the same way, we argue that the noises commonly present in the different environments also need to be explicitly dealt with, and, when possible, modeled within specific datasets with proper training. Our motivation comes from the observation that noise removal techniques (commonly called denoising), are not always fully (and generically) efficient. For instance, noise degeneration due to communication interference, which is almost always present in radio transmissions, has peculiarities that a simple mathematical formulation cannot model. This work presents a modeling technique composed of an augmented dataset-building approach and a profile identifier that can be used to build ASRs for noisy environments that perform similarly to those used in noise-free environments. As a case study, we developed a specific ASR for the interference noise in radio transmissions with its specific dataset, while comparing our results with other state-of-the-art work. As a result, we report a Character Error Rate value of 0.3163 for the developed ASR under several different noise conditions.
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1 Introduction

Speech recognition is the process of converting the human voice into a sequence of words and linguistic resources that provide an understanding of what is being said [Huang et al., 2001]. When it is done through an automated process, typically with software embedded in a device, this tool is often called an Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR) System [Li et al., 2014] that converts an audio waveform into a speech text transcription [Duarte and Colcher, 2021].

Due to their complexity and diversity caused by different languages and accents, such tools are usually built using Artificial Intelligence (AI) techniques that can be applied to construct an ASR efficiently and effectively, ensuring a good performance both in transcription quality and processing time. Currently, Machine Learning (ML) is the most well-known technique for building such recognizers, as it has the ability to learn from historical data—in this case, pairs of waveforms and their transcriptions. More specifically, Deep Learning (DL) techniques can be used not only to learn from the data but also to create expressive attributes from the raw waveform signal, replacing the work of a specialist in creating the essential attributes for the model.

In this context, Deep Speech [Hannun et al., 2014] stands out as a robust end-to-end speech system framework for developing and evaluating ASRs. It uses a Recurrent Neural Network (RNN) and the Connectionist Temporal Classification (CTC) loss functions to learn from data, in conjunction with a Language Model (LM), allowing the adjustment of several hyperparameters. Deep Speech has proven to have good results for the task, especially when considering the compromise of performance over training time, for the task on languages such as English and Mandarin [Amodei et al., 2016].

As ASRs are increasingly becoming part of everyone’s daily life [Duarte and Colcher, 2021], built into personal assistants and helping in the execution of common daily tasks, noise robustness is also becoming a natural requirement. Nevertheless, the construction of good ASRs is still a challenging task [Li et al., 2014], since they are increasingly employed in environments with high distortions and different characteristics from those employed when recording the datasets used for their training.

Much in the same way that ASRs need to have different training for each employed language, the noises commonly present in the environments in which they are used also need to be mapped and, when possible, modeled within the datasets, since natural removal techniques, like denoising, face several challenges related to limited training sources, where obtaining both clean and noisy audio samples proves difficult, and the fact that real-world audio signals usually contain inseparable noises. Consequently, denoising may not exhibit comparable performance in real-world settings in the same way as in controlled experimental environments [Zhang and Li, 2023].

Furthermore, most of the current work considers the noise
in ASRs as being a simple Additive White Gaussian Noise (AWGN) [Carlson et al., 2002], or uses collected noise samples from regular household appliances and urban noises [Yılmaz et al., 2014; Prodeus and Kukharicheva, 2017; Shimada et al., 2019; Maruf et al., 2020] such as cars or loud chats. Also, some works reduce the complexity of ASRs by using datasets with simple commands, names, or digits [Meneses Santos, 2016; Pervaiz et al., 2020]. These presumed simplifications frequently fall short of accurately capturing the true complexity of the noise environments in which the ASR will operate. This holds true despite the capability of neural networks, particularly those trained in a DL context, to extract hierarchical features from noisy data without necessarily relying on a priori knowledge of the noise model. For instance, noise degeneration due to communication interference, which is almost always present in radio transmissions, has peculiarities that a simple mathematical formulation cannot model [ITU, 1992]. For example, this is especially true in military communication environments such as high-frequency (HF) channels used in the Amazon rainforest. Also, the attempt to model noisy environments as reliably as possible has been addressed in various ways, as we see, for example, in published recommendations [ITU, 1992] for noise parameter setup.

In this sense, the Brazilian Army’s priority 1.1 [Centro Tecnológico do Exército, 2020] is the Software Defined Radio Project [Exército Brasileiro, 2019], and radios developed under this project can benefit from a technology that can automatically generate transcripts of received audio across different platforms. This is even more useful if incoming message storage is a requirement.

The main objective of this article is to present the proposal of modeling techniques that can be used to build ASRs used in specific noise environments that perform similarly to those trained and evaluated in noise-free environments. As a case study, noise from interference in radio transmissions is applied to a set of transcriptions in Portuguese [Duarte and Colcher, 2021]. The choice for the Portuguese language is due to the scarcity of related articles in this language [Quintanilha et al., 2020; Gris, 2021; Gris et al., 2022]. However, the methodology proposed here is generic and can be applied to any language.

We evaluate the developed ASRs with a dataset as close as possible to the noise environments in which they are meant to be used while comparing them with the state-of-the-art. To summarize, the contributions of this work are threefold. First, we contribute to the development of noise-robust ASRs by showing results obtained in a noisy communication environment. The steps presented here can be reproduced in any noisy environment as long as real-world data sets or mathematical models are available; Second, we also contribute to the development of Portuguese ASRs by comparing our results with other works that used similar datasets and language models. This can be used in any other language as long as datasets with pairs of audio and transcriptions are provided; Finally, we contribute to the development of a profile identifier that determines the best ASR to be applied in an audio file where its noise characteristics are unknown. Such profile identifier performs similarly (in terms of the performance measures) to the ASRs when compared to a perfect theoretical identifier.

In the remainder of this article, we will present the necessary steps to reproduce our results. First, in Section 2, we show related work, focusing on Portuguese ASRs as well as other works dealing with noisy environments. Section 3 presents the Deep Speech framework used in our experiments, while Section 4 presents the used dataset and proposed configuration for the development of noise-robust ASRs. We then conclude our evaluation in Section 5 with our experiments that show near state-of-the-art results for the task. Finally, concluding remarks and possible future work are presented in Section 6.

2 Related Work

This section frames our contribution in the context of existing research both on Portuguese and noise-robust ASRs, as these are the two main aspects for comparison with the results of our work.

Initially, Li et al. [2014] provide an in-depth survey of the theme of robust noise ASRs, comparing more than 50 works in the field in terms of domain processing (feature versus model), distortion modeling (implicit versus explicit), prior knowledge of the distortion, processing (deterministic versus uncertain) and training (joint versus disjoint). The authors point out the good results as well as the challenges in using a Deep Neural Network (DNN) for this type of system, since DNNs provide a strong normalization to heterogeneous data present in noisy audio in the form of new powerful features that can then be used by other techniques such as an Hidden Markov Model (HMM). We highlight, then, more recent works on the theme of noise-robust ASRs.

Yılmaz et al. [2014] propose the use of Noise Robust Exemplar Matching (N-REM) with the Active Noise Exemplar Selection (ANES) technique that extracts noise exemplars from noise-only training sequences. The authors used the Chime-2 and Aurora-2 datasets formed by utterances in English combined with several types of noise such as subway, car, restaurant, and street, among others, and obtained results of 93.5% accuracy (Signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) 9 dB) and Word Error Rates (WERs) of 4.9% and 5.6% (SNR 10 dB).

Conversely, Wang and Wang [2016] combine two DNNs with a speech separation front-end and an acoustic model to form a better network for ASR, while adjusting the weights for each module. Experiments that were conducted by adding reverberant noises such as speakers, electronic devices, footsteps, and laughter to the English Chime-2 dataset consisting of multiple utterances, achieved an WER of 10.63%.

Meneses Santos [2016] proposes the use of a hybrid model that uses both a CNNs and a HMM to build an ASR for a dataset that contains Portuguese utterances and digits. He used noises from different sources like chitchat, engines, and industry while obtaining accuracies ranging from 88.91% to 99.67%.

In two different works, Prodeus and Kukharicheva [2016; 2017] propose the use of training ASRs with noise samples such as grinders, computers, and trucks that use the Fully Matched Training (FMT) and Spectrum Matched Training.
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3 The Deep Speech framework
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Table 1. Related work summary for noise-robust and Portuguese-based ASRs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Techniques</th>
<th>Datasets</th>
<th>Noise types</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Main result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yılmaz et al. [2014]</td>
<td>N-REM, ANES</td>
<td>Chime-2, Aurora-2</td>
<td>mainly street noises</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Acc. - 93.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang and Wang [2016]</td>
<td>DNN</td>
<td>Chime-2</td>
<td>in-house reverberant noises</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>WER - 10.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menêses Santos [2016]</td>
<td>CNN, HMM</td>
<td>Utterances and digits</td>
<td>chitchat, engines, and industry noises</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Acc. - 88.91% to 99.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prodeus and Kukharicheva [2016; 2017]</td>
<td>FMT, SMT</td>
<td>Names and numbers</td>
<td>urban noises</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Acc. - 95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang et al. [2018]</td>
<td>DNN</td>
<td>Utterances</td>
<td>reverberation, interference, and background noises</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>WER - 6.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribeiro [2019]</td>
<td>MLP, SOM</td>
<td>Simple commands</td>
<td>multimedia noises</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>WER reduction - 19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimada et al. [2019]</td>
<td>MVDR, MNMF</td>
<td>Chime-3</td>
<td>urban noises</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>WER - 13.88% to 16.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maruf et al. [2020]</td>
<td>CNN</td>
<td>Utterances and digits</td>
<td>urban noises</td>
<td>Bangla</td>
<td>Acc. - 93.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pervaiz et al. [2020]</td>
<td>DNN, LSTM, CNN</td>
<td>Speech Command</td>
<td>running taps, dishwashing, and white and pink noises</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Top-One error - 88.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan et al. [2021]</td>
<td>GRF</td>
<td>AISHELL-1</td>
<td>traffic, animals, claps, and shower noises</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>CER reduction - 10.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintanilha et al. [2020]</td>
<td>DNN</td>
<td>LibriSpeech, BRSD</td>
<td>clean speech</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>CER - 10.49% WER - 24.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gris [2021]</td>
<td>DNN</td>
<td>mainly Common Voice</td>
<td>clean speech</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>WER - 11.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candido Junior et al. [2023]</td>
<td>DNN</td>
<td>CORAA, Common Voice</td>
<td>background noise, spontaneous speech</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>CER - 11.02% 6.34% WER - 24.18% 20.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scart et al. [2022]</td>
<td>DNN, CNN</td>
<td>Common Voice</td>
<td>narrowband FM channel</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>CER reduction - 51.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This work</td>
<td>DNN</td>
<td>Common Voice</td>
<td>communication interference noises</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>CER - 31.64% (SNR&gt;0) CER - 23.00% (SNR30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The deep methodology, highlighting its contribution.

Deep Speech allows not only the use of pre-trained ASR models but also their construction from scratch, simply feeding the tool with a dataset of audio files and respective transcriptions in the target language, as well as setting a diverse set of hyperparameters for the neural networks used, such as the number of neurons per layer, dropout and learning rates, among others.

Figure 1 shows the basic architecture of Deep Speech, which consists of an RNN architecture with five hidden layers. The first three layers, like the fifth, are composed of non-recurring neurons and use a clipped rectified-linear (ReLU) activation function. The outputs from the previous layers are used as the inputs to the next ones. The fourth layer is a recurring LSTM that includes a set of hidden units with forward recurrence. Finally, the output layer uses a softmax function that outputs the probabilities for each character considered in the alphabet.

In order to train their RNNs, Deep Speech uses the Connectionist Temporal Classification (CTC) [Graves et al., 2006;
loss function that transforms the outputs into conditional probabilities over all alphabet sequences. Those probabilities can then be used to predict the most probable labels for a given sequence.

The main idea of CTC is to provide a free alignment between the input and output sequences. CTC works by summing over the probability of all possible alignments among all possible outputs of an input. With this in mind, the transcription $BAR$, for instance, also depicted in Figure 1, can be recognized by multiple outputs such as $BARR$, $BAAR$, and $BAR$ itself. To recover the output sequence, any sequence of the same characters from the alphabet is replaced by that character, which results in two problems. First, the input can have silence streaks without a character for the output. Also, multiple characters in a row can appear in a transcript, such as in the word passes.

To solve these problems, CTC introduces a dummy blank token ($\epsilon$) for the alphabet that can represent the absence of a character or sequences of the same character. Whenever the token $\epsilon$ is generated, the sequences of the same characters are not merged and, in the end, the token is simply removed from the output. With this simple approach, the word passes, for instance, can be produced by the passes output, without loss of representation.

In addition to the classification process that uses DNNs, Deep Speech allows the use of an “external scorer” that makes corrections in the transcriptions after the neural network recognition process. This external scorer is composed of a prefix tree data structure that contains all possible vocabulary words and a language model [Mozilla Corporation, 2020].

A Language Model (LM), applied as a post-processing step, assigns probabilities for word sequences present in a training corpus [Jurański and Martin, 2021]. The idea behind this is that spoken words correlate, meaning that the next possible words in a sentence have probabilities based on their general appearance in the language. For instance, after the definite article the, there cannot be a verb, so the probability of any verb after the word the is null.¹

Using language models helps fix small mistakes made by the recognizer, which would deteriorate performance in terms of word recognition. Deep Speech supports the usage of the KenLM Language Model Implementation [Heafield, 2011] and two hyperparameters to control the effects of the language model, $\alpha$ and $\beta$. $\alpha$ controls the weight of the language model about the output of the neural network. A value of zero, for example, disables its usage. Conversely, $\beta$ controls the weight of word insertion, which can be useful, especially if the recognizer misses some small words. A model optimizer script provided by Deep Speech can automatically determine these values.

4 Designing a noise-robust automatic speech recognition

This section presents the setup necessary to reproduce the experiments reported in Section 5 and is divided into two parts. The first part contains the details about the dataset used and its subsets used in the training and evaluation phases of the ASRs developed in this work. The second part describes the selected hyperparameters for configuring Deep Speech.

4.1 Dataset

In all our experiments we use the Common Voice Dataset [Ardila et al., 2020], more specifically, the Portuguese subset of the noisy version developed by Duarte and Colcher [2021]. The reason for choosing such a dataset is that, currently, Common Voice is a benchmark for comparing ASRs. Particularly, its noisy version fulfills the necessary requirements for this work, which are: Portuguese language; and different noises from radio communication interference.

The noisy dataset has four distinct subsets, and each subset has noises with the following Signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) relations: {-30, -20, -10, -5, 0, 5, 10, 20, 30}, following all recommendations provided by ITU [1992]. SNR measures the degree of noise contamination in the signal [Carlson et al., 2002]. A small value, usually negative, indicates a high degree of degeneration due to noise. Thus, even reporting statistics on all listed SNRs, the discussion of results will be limited to their positive values, since for negative SNRs, even the human ear has extreme difficulty in understanding what is being said.

The four different subsets contain different ways to add noise to the original base. The first subset uses a simple and generic Additive White Gaussian Noise (AWGN). Conversely, the second subset contemplates the addition of noises collected directly from HF receivers in the form of files that can be merged into the original base. The third subset implements, via software, complex mathematical models for the representation of such noises. Such models incorporate the simulation of parameters reported in official recommendations [ITU, 1992]. Finally, the fourth subset contains files generated through a dedicated device that performs the complete simulation of a customized HF channel using several parameters also present in recommendations [Duarte and Colcher, 2021].

Figure 2 shows an example of the same file subjected to different forms of noise (SNR = 10) in the dataset. It is interesting to note that, although the files are very similar visually, the built ASRs lose performance when submitted to different subsets than those for which they were trained.

The fourth subset implements the most effective way to generate simulated noise through an HF channel. For this reason, this subset is used in the training phase of our SNRs. Regardless of that, to be able to compare the four strategies implemented in the dataset, we report the results in all subsets.

4.2 Deep Speech Setup

Since Deep Speech implements the development of ASRs through deep neural networks, the choice of hyperparameters plays an important role in its training and consequent performance. Thus, a poor choice of hyperparameters can invalidate the comparison of ASRs, even when the objective

¹ There are special cases where noun verbs can follow a definite article.
is mostly to verify the impact of using noisy datasets in their training.

Conversely, choosing the “best” hyperparameter set can be a costly task, especially with very large datasets. Keeping that in mind, we followed some recommendations also used for developing ASRs for other languages [Duarte and Colcher, 2021].

All hyperparameters were set to the default values, except the ones provided in Table 2. Also, the batch training size was set to 16. This was the maximum value at which the experiments could be run on our computing infrastructure, due to memory limitations available to each Graphics Processing Unit (GPU).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epochs</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurons per Layer</td>
<td>2048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature Extraction Audio Window Length</td>
<td>32 ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Rate</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout Rate</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Deep Speech hyperparameter settings

In terms of using the language model, the same principle cannot be applied. Language models are language dependent and their best parameters (α and β) should be chosen according to the data sets and alphabets used for training the ASR. Following this idea, a straightforward language model was trained using the KenLM tool [Heafield, 2011] compatible with Deep Speech. Furthermore, Deep Speech’s lm_optimize script was used to find the best values for α and β. The language model generation was performed using the validated subset of the dataset, and, of course, better models can be created using larger text Portuguese corpora, but for our tests, the derived language model has already greatly improved the performance of the ASRs in terms of WER.

4.3 ASR Profile Identifier

Noise environments exhibit significant variation in terms of type and conditions, posing a challenge for a singular ASR to effectively handle every aspect. By training multiple ASRs under different setups, it is possible to employ a strategy to selectively choose the most appropriate one. In essence, this approach allows the implementation of a strategy for determining the optimal ASR to use at any given time.

Here, as we may have ASRs trained in different circumstances, in our case trained with different SNR values, we could choose the most suitable ASR for each processed audio. In our case, we train a MLP neural network called Profile Identifier (PI), whose main objective is to choose, among the trained ASRs, which one was trained under the most similar noisy or noise-free environment.

To train the PI, we extract the MFCC features from the training dataset, dividing all files into audio slices. These MFCC features are then used as inputs to a MLP training process.

5 Experiments and Results

We present here the analysis of the results of the experiments carried out in order to show our methodology for building noise-robust ASRs. The materials needed to reproduce the experiments are listed in the “Availability of data and materials” of this article, making available the source codes for Deep Speech [Hamun et al., 2014], Common Voice [Ardila et al., 2020] and its noisy-version [Duarte and Colcher, 2021].

Basically, we want to provide evidence of three main aspects, which are: dealing with noisy audio data in the training process, applying an LM after the classification process, and using a profile identifier to determine the better ASR to be applied for each instance. As already stated in Section 4, we will only consider the fourth subset of the full dataset, limited to its positive values of SNR for training, in order to ensure a fair evaluation. Conversely, all subsets will be reported in the evaluation.

We begin with the premise that random white noise cannot accurately represent a real-world noisy environment. This is supported by our initial experiments [Duarte and Colcher, 2021] and is consistent with the findings of all related works on noise in ASRs presented in Section 2.

First, we evaluate the performance results in terms of CER...
for the trained ASR using only noiseless audio, as shown in Figure 3. This is similar to the initial evaluation conducted by Duarte and Colcher [2021] and it will serve us as a baseline result. We can see that all subsets show the same pattern, where the results improve with higher values of SNR. The best results are always for the clean (noise-free) subset.

Second, when comparing all generated SNRs by further augmenting the training dataset, we see better results in terms of average CERs across all test subsets with a positive SNR value. We show these values on the third column of Table 3, where we can see the improvement behavior in terms of the average CER up to the second-to-last augmented set. This indicates that augmenting with very noisy audio can degrade performance.

In the next experiment, we want to evaluate the impact of adding a LM to the output of the generated ASRs. This is extremely important since ASRs make many single character mistakes which impact little on CER but a lot on WER. For instance, a single character error in a ten-length word penalizes 10% in terms of CER, while completely nullifying (100% error) that word, in terms of WER. A good LM can slightly improve CER results while greatly improving WER.

Table 3 presents the results of each individual ASR, while training and evaluating with the same SNR values, with and without the LM. For all trained ASRs, the LM is the same, as already stated in Section 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNR</th>
<th>CER (Clean)</th>
<th>CER (SNR&gt;0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>0.3049</td>
<td>0.5275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNR30+Clean</td>
<td>0.2886</td>
<td>0.4608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNR20+SNR30+Clean</td>
<td>0.2936</td>
<td>0.4058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNR10+SNR20+SNR30+Clean</td>
<td>0.2981</td>
<td>0.3709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Training Set</td>
<td>0.3306</td>
<td>0.3902</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we can see in Table 4, both CER and WER take advantage of using the LM. CER shows an average percent improvement of 8.79% while WER presents a huge 31.75% improvement on average.

Finally, we report the results of our experiments using the PI strategy that determines the best ASR to use at any given time. After some preliminary tests to find the optimal hyperparameter setup for the MLP, we discovered that the setup outlined in Table 5 exhibited the most favorable performance-to-training time ratio. The trained classifier can then be used to determine the SNR value of any audio, among our fixed list: CLEAN, SNR30, SNR20, SNR10, and SNR5.

Figure 6 shows the results obtained by the PI on the test dataset. The primary idea is to illustrate the specific instances where the Profile Identifier (PI) tends to make more errors when attempting to identify the SNR noise values utilized in the training dataset. As we can see in this figure, the PI has great overall results, an accuracy of 0.74, but its performance

![Figure 3. CER results for the noise-free trained ASR](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNR</th>
<th>CER</th>
<th>WER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SNR05</td>
<td>0.5169</td>
<td>0.4492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNR10</td>
<td>0.4478</td>
<td>0.3777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNR20</td>
<td>0.3741</td>
<td>0.2801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNR30</td>
<td>0.3265</td>
<td>0.2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEAN</td>
<td>0.3049</td>
<td>0.1936</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we can see in Table 4, both CER and WER take advantage of using the LM. CER shows an average percent improvement of 8.79% while WER presents a huge 31.75% improvement on average.

Finally, we report the results of our experiments using the PI strategy that determines the best ASR to use at any given time. After some preliminary tests to find the optimal hyperparameter setup for the MLP, we discovered that the setup outlined in Table 5 exhibited the most favorable performance-to-training time ratio. The trained classifier can then be used to determine the SNR value of any audio, among our fixed list: CLEAN, SNR30, SNR20, SNR10, and SNR5.

Figure 6 shows the results obtained by the PI on the test dataset. The primary idea is to illustrate the specific instances where the Profile Identifier (PI) tends to make more errors when attempting to identify the SNR noise values utilized in the training dataset. As we can see in this figure, the PI has great overall results, an accuracy of 0.74, but its performance
Parameter                Value                
Neurons                  Number of MFCC Features 
Iterations               30                    
Audio slices             10                    
Alpha Value              0.0001                
Solver                   L-BFGS                 
Learning Rate            0.1                    

Table 5. Hyperparameter setup for the PI training process

Figure 4. CER results for each trained ASR with noise variant audio data (one SNR value). We also compare it to a theoretical “perfect” PI that knows the answer of which SNR value was used to generate the noisy data. We denote this theoretical PI as the LowerBound for our strategy. Keep in mind that the results shown in this figure are not the same as those shown in Table 4, as that table shows results over the individual noisy datasets, while Figure 7 shows averages across all noisy datasets.

As we can see, the provided strategy improves the results on all individually trained ASRs, while presenting competitive results over the theoretical LowerBound strategy. This indicates that even making small mistakes in terms of the SNR value of the audio file, the chosen ASR can provide a good transcription. For example, the averages CER and WER (with the LM) for the PI are, respectively, 0.3163 and 0.5067, while for the “SNR20”-trained ASR (best individually) are 0.3982 and 0.5886. On the other hand, the best theoretical results, which are, respectively, 0.3061 and 0.4848, provide only a small improvement.

As a learning experience from the experiments carried out with the proposed trained ASRs, we can initially notice that training with noisy data is a good strategy, mainly, but not
limited to, when the noise profile present in audio is known. If the noise profile is unknown, even ASRs trained under similar conditions can provide good results, either using a data augmentation strategy to build the training dataset or a hybrid strategy where members of an ASR committee can be selected individually. Also, the use of an LM is very important, as ASRs generated with such techniques can lead to simple common errors that can be easily corrected, providing...
better results in terms of WER.

All experiments presented here were performed with the same type of noise, originated from communication interference, and specialized based on its SNR, the most important attribute in this model. We may extrapolate that similar performance and behavior can be obtained by generated ASRs for other noise types or parameter variations in the modeling, as long as it is provided a way to represent such noise within the training dataset, either by collected examples, mathematical modeling, or dedicated systems for their generation. In this way, the more reliable this representation, the better the performance of the generated ASRs when applied to the same conditions in which the audios used in the training were obtained, while the ASRs generated with only noise-free audio, generally, perform worse.

6 Conclusion

The development of ASRs has become increasingly important due to their widespread use in several devices. Still, their performance often suffers in noisy environments where generic data augmentation techniques are ineffective, highlighting the need to integrate real noisy data into training for improved performance. The main aim of this work was to present a methodology for training ASRs in noise-specific environments, using representations of target noise obtained through mathematical modeling or noisy samples. Multiple approaches were presented for constructing these ASRs, employing traditional DNN training via the Deep Speech tool, along with techniques like data augmentation, hybrid models, and ensemble methods. Experimental results showed that the proposed training strategies improve ASR performance, with the hybrid ASR, incorporating noise characteristics, improving WER by 18.70% compared to ASRs trained solely on noise-free audio.

The contributions of the present work outpace the development of an ASR for the Portuguese language robust to telecommunications noise. In addition to the development and experimentation of an ASR prototype that deals with characteristic noises, our contribution lies in providing substantiating evidence endorsing the inclusion of noisy audio during the training phase, through traditional training of DNNs, ensemble methods that select the best ASR to be used for each audio input, and models trained using data augmentation techniques targeting at the characteristics present in the audio. Such experiments show that the training of ASRs can highly benefit from these data, in addition to the use of language models that allow the correction of transcription errors. All evaluations showed better results than the considered baseline Duarte and Colcher [2021], which was specifically designed to showcase an experiment intended to evaluate the feasibility of using the proposed dataset.

Despite the contributions made in this work, certain limitations should be acknowledged. Firstly, the utilization of a dataset in a single language restricts the scope of performance comparison. Expanding to multiple languages could provide a more comprehensive understanding of the proposed methodology’s efficacy across linguistic variations. Furthermore, the hardware infrastructure imposed limitations on conducting experiments with more powerful ASR development frameworks, and the access to enhanced computational resources would enable the use of more complex ASR models, improving the performance of the proposed methodology. Additionally, while the study predominantly focuses on modern DL approaches for denoising, the incorporation of traditional techniques for denoising was not explored. Integrating classical denoising approaches could offer valuable insights and contribute to a better evaluation of the proposed methodology.

As future work, moving forward, we intend to experiment with other noisy environments by changing the distortion parameters and creating even more specialized ASRs. Another noisy environment of interest is the Industry, where equipment and tools can create a hostile noisy environment for ASRs, particularly when using helmets and communication headsets. We also plan to improve the developed ASRs, incorporating more complex models into the training, as well as better language models. For example, the training methodology proposed here can be incorporated into the work of Quintanilha et al. [2020] or Gris et al. 2021; 2022, who also addressed the Portuguese language, generating ASRs with even better performance than those reported here. Additionally, recent models such as Whisper [Radford et al., 2023] demonstrated significant robustness to noise, making it worthwhile to compare their performance for the specific noise context proposed here. Since employing an ensemble of ASR models may be computationally intensive, future research might focus on models that enhance audio quality before feeding it into the ASR, thereby improving the performance of any model used. Furthermore, the idea behind the profile identifier can be expanded to address other audio challenges, such as multiple speakers or different accents. Finally, we intend to test our methodology in another language, more precisely English, as there are many datasets available, to determine if the same kind of improvements are valid for other languages.
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