Abstract

Finding measures (or features) invariant to inevitable variations caused by non-linguistic factors (transformations) is a fundamental yet important problem in speech recognition. Recently, Minematsu [1, 2] proved that Bhattacharyya distance (BD) between two distributions is invariant to invertible transforms on feature space, and develop an invariant structural representation of speech based on it. There is a question: which kind of measures can be invariant? In this paper, we prove that \( f\)-divergence yields a generalized family of invariant measures, and show that all the invariant measures have to be written in the forms of \( f\)-divergence. Many famous distances and divergences in information and statistics, such as Bhattacharyya distance (BD), KL-divergence, Hellinger distance, can be written into forms of \( f\)-divergence. As an application, we carried out experiments on recognizing the utterances of connected Japanese vowels. The experimental results show that BD and KL have the best performance among the measures compared.
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1. Introduction

Speech signals inevitably exhibit variations caused by non-linguistic factors, such as, gender, age, noise etc. The same text can be converted to different acoustic observations due to the differences of speaker and environments. Modern speech recognition methods deal with these variations largely by using the statistical methods (such as GMM, HMM) to model the distributions of the data. These methods can achieve relatively high recognition rates when using proper models and sufficient training data. However, to estimate reliable distributions, these methods always require a large number of samples for training. The successful commercial speech recognition systems always make use of millions of data from thousands of speakers for training [3]. However, it is very different from children’s spoken language acquisition. A child does not need to hear the voices of thousands of people before he (or she) can understand speech. This fact largely indicates that there may exist robust measures of speech which are nearly invariant to non-linguistic variations. It is by these robust measures, we consider that young children can learn speech by hearing very biased training data called “mother and father”. This fact is also partly supported by recent advances in the neuroscience, which shows that the linguistic aspect of speech and the non-linguistic aspect are processed separately in the auditory cortex [4].

Recently, Minematsu found that Bhattacharyya distance (BD) is invariant to transformations (linear or nonlinear) on feature space [1, 2], and proposed an invariant structural representation of speech signal. Our previous works have demonstrated the effectiveness of invariant structural representation in both speech recognition task [5, 6, 7] and computer aided language learning (CALL) systems [8, 9].

There is a question: are there invariant measures other than BD, or, more generally, which kind of measures can be invariant? In this paper, we show that \( f\)-divergence [10, 11] provides a family of invariant measures and prove all invariant measures of integration type must be written as the forms of \( f\)-divergence. \( f\)-divergence family includes many famous distances and divergences in information and statistics, such as, Bhattacharyya distance, KL-divergence, Hellinger distance, Pearson divergence, and so on. We also carried out experiments to compare several well-known forms of \( f\)-divergence through a task of recognizing connected Japanese vowel utterances. The experimental results show that BD and KL have the best performance among the measures compared.

2. Invariance of \( f\)-divergence

In probability theory, Csiszár \( f\)-divergence [10] (also known as Ali-Silvey distance [11]) measures the difference of two distributions. Formally,

\[
\text{f-div}(p_i(x), p_j(x)) = \int p_j(x) g\left( \frac{p_i(x)}{p_j(x)} \right) dx, \tag{1}
\]

where \( p_i(x) \) and \( p_j(x) \) are two distributions on feature space \( X \). \( g(t) \) is a convex function defined for \( t > 0 \), and \( g(1) = 0 \). \( X \) can be a \( n \)-dimensional space with coordinates \( (x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \). In this way, Eq. 1 is a multidimensional integration and \( dx = dx_1 dx_2 ... dx_n \). Generally, it is required that \( \text{f-div}(p_i(x), p_j(x)) \geq 0 \) for any two distributions \( p_i(x), p_j(x) \). It can be proved that \( \text{f-div}(p_i(x), p_j(x)) = 0 \), if and only if \( p_i(x) = p_j(x) \) [12]. Many well known distances and divergences in statsitics and information theory can be seen as special examples of \( f\)-divergence. Table 1 lists some examples.

Table 1: Examples of \( f\)-divergence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>distance or divergence</th>
<th>corresponding ( g(t) = \frac{e^{tx} - 1}{t} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHATTACHARYYA DISTANCE 1</td>
<td>( \sqrt{t} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KL-DIVERGENCE</td>
<td>( t \log(t) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYMMETRIC KL-DIVERGENCE</td>
<td>( \log(t) + \log(t) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE LLINGER DISTANCE</td>
<td>( \frac{(\sqrt{t}-1)^2}{t} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL VARIATION</td>
<td>( \frac{t}{t-1} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEARSON DIVERGENCE</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{2} (t \log t + \log 2) )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \frac{\text{Bhattacharyya distance}}{t} \) is a function of a \( f\)-divergence: \( BD(p_i, p_j) = - \log \int (p_i(x)p_j(x))^{1/2} dx = - \log \text{f-div}(p_i, p_j) \).
convert $x$ into new feature $y$. In this way, distributions $p_i(x)$ and $p_j(x)$ is transformed to $q_i(y)$ and $q_j(y)$, respectively. We wish to find measures invariant $f$ to transformation $h$, $f(p_i, p_j) = f(q_i, q_j)$. The invariant measures can serve as robust features for speech analysis and classification. We have the following theorem as shown in Fig. 1.

**Theorem 1** The $f$-divergence between two distributions is invariant under invertible transformation $h$ on feature space $X$,

\[ f_{div}(p_i(x), p_j(x)) = f_{div}(q_i(y), q_j(y)). \]

**Proof** Under transformation $y = h(x)$, distribution $q_i(y)$ is calculated by,

\[ q_i(y) = p_i(h^{-1}(y))J(y), \]

where $h^{-1}$ denotes the inverse function of $h$, and $J(y)$ is the absolute value of the determinant of the Jacobian matrix of function $h^{-1}(y)$.

Recall $dx = J(y)dy$, we have,

\[
\begin{align*}
\int f_{div}(p_i, p_j) &= \int p_j(y)g\left(\frac{p_i(y)}{p_j(y)}\right)dy \\
&= \int p_j(h^{-1}(y))g\left(\frac{p_i(h^{-1}(y))J(y)}{p_j(h^{-1}(y))J(y)}\right)J(y)dy \\
&= \int q_j(y)g\left(\frac{q_i(y)}{q_j(y)}\right)dy \\
&= f_{div}(q_i, q_j).\end{align*}
\]

Let $F : R \rightarrow R$ denote any real value function. It is easy to see that $F(f_{div}(p_i(x), p_j(x)))$ is also invariant to transformation. In the next, we consider a more general form of Eq. 1. $M(p_i(x), p_j(x)) = \int G(p_i(x), p_j(x))p_i(x)dx$, which we call integration measure. There is a question, whether or not there exist invariant integration measures other than $f$-divergence? The answer is NO.

**Theorem 2** All the invariant integration measures have to be written in form $\int p_j(x)g\left(\frac{p_i(x)}{p_j(x)}\right)dx$.

**Proof** Assume $M(p_i, p_j) = \int p_j(x)G(p_i(x), p_j(x))dx$ be an invariant integration measure, $M(p_i(x), p_j(x)) = M(q_i(y), q_j(y))$. We have,

\[
\begin{align*}
M(p_i, p_j) &= \int p_j(x)G(p_i(x), p_j(x))dx \\
&= \int p_j(h^{-1}(y))G(p_i(h^{-1}(y)), p_j(h^{-1}(y)))J(y)dy \\
&= \int q_j(y)G(q_i(y), J(y)^{-1}, q_j(y)J(y)^{-1})dy \\
&= M(q_i(y), q_j(y)) = \int q_j(y)G(q_i(y), q_j(y))dy.\end{align*}
\]

Remind that $q_j(y)$ can be any distribution function. Thus the following equations must always hold,

\[
G(q_i(y)J(y)^{-1}, q_j(y)J(y)^{-1}) \equiv G(q_i(y), q_j(y)). \quad (6)
\]

Otherwise, we can find $q_j(y)$ that breaks Eq. 5.

Introduce functions $t(y) = q_i(y)/q_j(y)$ and $G^*(t, q_j) = G(q_i, q_j)$. Thus Eq. 6 becomes:

\[
G^*(t(y), q_j(y))J(y)^{-1} \equiv G^*(t(y), q_j(y)). \quad (7)
\]

Remind that we don’t have any limitations on transformation $h$. Thus it is possible to set that $q_j(y) = J(y)$. Then, we have,

\[
G^*(t(y), q_j(y)) \equiv G^*(t(y), 1). \quad (8)
\]

Therefore $G^*(t(y), q_j(y))$ can be written into the form of $G^*(t(y)) = g(q_i(y)/q_j(y))$. In this way, we prove that $M(p_i(x), p_j(x))$ has to be written in the form $\int p_j(x)g\left(\frac{p_i(x)}{p_j(x)}\right)dx$.

Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 together show the sufficiency and necessity of the invariance of $f$-divergence. Generally, $f$-divergence may not be a metric, since it may not satisfy symmetry rule ($f_{div}(p_i(x), p_j(x)) \neq f_{div}(p_j(x), p_i(x))$) and subadditivity triangle inequality ($f_{div}(p_i(x), p_j(x)) + f_{div}(p_j(x), p_k(x)) < f_{div}(p_i(x), p_k(x))$). But there exist special forms of $f$-divergence, which is also a metric. Hellinger distance is such an example, $\text{HDP}(p_i, p_j) = \int(\sqrt{p_i(x)} - \sqrt{p_j(x)})^2 dx$.

### 3. Calculation of $f$-divergence

There is a problem of how to calculate $f$-divergence. Unfortunately, in general case, there exists no closed-form solution for $f$-divergence of Eq. 1. However, when distributions are Gaussian, there may exist closed-form solutions. Assume $p_i(x)$ and $p_j(x)$ are Gaussian distributions with mean $\mu_i$ and $\mu_j$ and covariance $\Sigma_i$ and $\Sigma_j$, respectively. The canonical parametrization of $p_i(x)$ is,

\[
p_i(x) = \exp(\alpha_i + \eta_i^T x - \frac{1}{2}x^T \Lambda_i x), \quad (9)
\]

where $\Lambda_i = \Sigma_i^{-1}$, $\eta_i = \Sigma_i^{-1} \mu_i$ and $\alpha_i = -0.5(d \log 2\pi - \log|\Lambda_i| + \eta_i^T \Lambda_i \eta_i)$. Similarly, we have

\[
p_j(x) = \exp(\alpha_j + \eta_j^T x - \frac{1}{2}x^T \Lambda_j x). \quad (10)
\]

Then, Eq. 1 can be written into,

\[
\begin{align*}
\int f_{div}(p_i(x), p_j(x)) &= \int \exp(\alpha_i + \eta_i^T x - \frac{1}{2}x^T \Lambda_i x) \\
g(\exp(\alpha_i - \alpha_j + (\eta_i - \eta_j)^T x - \frac{1}{2}x^T (\Lambda_i - \Lambda_j) x))dx.
\end{align*}
\]

The above form is near to Fourier transform or bilateral Laplace transform which has been widely studied. Many forms of $g$ can lead to closed form solutions of the integrations of $f$-divergence. Some examples are given as follows.

1) Bhattacharyya distance:

\[
BD(p_i(x), p_j(x)) = \frac{1}{8} (\mu_i - \mu_j)^T \left(\frac{\Sigma_i + \Sigma_j}{2}\right)^{-1} (\mu_i - \mu_j) + \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{|\Sigma_i + \Sigma_j|/2}{|\Sigma_i|^{1/2} |\Sigma_j|^{1/2}}.
\]
2) KL divergence:

\[
KL(p_i(x), p_j(x)) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \log \frac{\Sigma_j}{\Sigma_i} + tr(\Sigma_j^{-1} \Sigma_i) + (\mu_j - \mu_i)^T \Sigma_j^{-1} (\mu_j - \mu_i) \right).
\] (13)

3) Hellinger distance:

\[
HD(p_i(x), p_j(x)) = 1 - \exp(-BD(p_i(x), p_j(x))).
\] (14)

In general case, we can use Monte-Carlo sampling to calculate \(f\)-divergence. But this is always computationally expensive, especially when \(x\) has a high dimension. When \(p_i(x)\) and \(p_j(x)\) are Gaussian mixtures, one can use approximated techniques, such as, uncentered transform [13] and variational approximation for fast calculation [14].

4. Invariant structural representation using \(f\)-divergence

\(f\)-divergence can be used to construct the invariant structural representation of a pattern. Consider pattern \(P\) in feature space \(X\). Suppose \(P\) can be decomposed into a sequence of \(m\) events \(\{p_i\}_{i=1}^m\). Each event is described as a distribution \(p_i(x)\). We calculate the \(f\)-divergence \(D_{ij}\) between two distributions \(p_i(x), p_j(x)\), and construct an \(m \times m\) divergence matrix \(D^f\) with \(D^f(i,j) = D_{ij}\) and \(D^f(i,i) = 0\). Then \(D^f\) provides a structural representation of pattern \(P\). Assume there is a map \(f: X \to Y\) (linear or nonlinear) which transforms \(X\) into a new feature space \(Y\). In this way, pattern \(P\) in \(X\) is mapped to pattern \(Q\) in \(Y\), and event \(p_i\) is transformed to event \(q_i\). Similarly, we can calculate structure representation \(D^Q\) for pattern \(Q\). From Theorem 1, we have that \(D^Q = D^f\), which indicates that the structural representation based on \(f\)-divergence is invariant to transformations on feature space.

In the next, we describe a brief introduction on how to obtain a structural representation from an utterance [1, 5]. As shown in Fig. 2, at first, we calculate a sequence of cepstral features from input speech waveforms. Then an HMM is trained based on that cepstrum sequence and each state of HMM is described as a distribution \(p_i(x)\). Thirdly we calculate the \(f\)-divergences between each pair of \(p_i\) and \(p_j\). These distances will form an \(m \times m\) distance matrix \(D\) with zero diagonal, which is the structural representation. For convenience, we can expand \(D\) into a vector \(z\) with dimension \(m(m - 1)/2\). If the \(f\)-divergence used satisfies the symmetry rule \(f_{div}(p_i, p_j) = f_{div}(p_j, p_i)\) (for examples, Bhattacharyya distance, Hellinger distance, total variations), \(D\) is a symmetric matrix. In this case, we only need use the upper triangle of \(D\) and \(z\) has dimension \(m(m - 1)/2\).

It can be shown that many non-linguistic variations [1, 2], such as the length of vowel tract [15], such as the transformation of feature space. Suppose that \(X\) and \(Y\) represent the acoustic spaces of two speakers \(A\) and \(B\), and \(P\) and \(Q\) represent two utterances of \(A\) and \(B\), respectively. Then \(h\) can be seen as a mapping function from \(A\)’s utterance to \(B\)’s. In fact, this problem has been widely addressed in the speaker adaptation of speech recognition research and the speaker conversion of speech synthesis research. In Maximum Likelihood Linear Regression (MLLR) based speaker adaption [16], a linear transformation: \(y = h(x) = Hx + d\) is used, where \(H\) and \(d\) denote rotation and translation parameters respectively. For matching utterances \(P\) and \(Q\), the speaker adaption methods need to explicitly estimate transformation parameters (i.e. \(H\) and \(d\)), which lead to the minimum difference. This minimum difference serves as a matching score of utterances. [2] showed that the acoustic matching score of two utterances after shift and rotation (Fig. 3) can be approximated only with the difference of the two structures of the utterances without explicitly estimating transformation parameters.

5. Experiments

To compare the performance of various forms of \(f\)-divergence on speech recognition, we used the connected Japanese vowel utterances [5] in experiments. It is known that acoustic features of vowel sounds exhibit larger between-speaker variations than consonant sounds. Each word in the data set corresponds to a combination of the five Japanese vowels ‘a’, ‘e’, ‘i’, ‘o’ and ‘u’, such as ‘aeiou’, ‘uaioe’, ‘...’. So there are totally 120 words. The utterances of 16 speakers (8 males and 8 females) were recorded. Every speaker provides 5 utterances for each word. So the total number of utterances is 16×120×5=9,600. Among them, we use 4,800 utterances from 4 male and 4 female speakers for training and the other 4,800 utterances for testing.

For each utterance, we calculate the twelve Mel-cepstrum features and one power coefficient. Then HMM training is used to convert a cepstrum vector sequence into 25 events (distributions). Since we have only one training sample, we used an MAP-based learning algorithm [17]. Each state (event) of a HMM is described by a 13-dimension Gaussian distribution with a diagonal covariance matrix. Following [5], we divided
Table 2: Comparisons of recognition rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>NN</th>
<th>NM</th>
<th>GM</th>
<th>RDSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bhattacharyya dis.</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellinger dis.</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>symmetric KL-div.</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Comparison of the recognition rates of different distances and different numbers of speakers in training data.

6. Conclusions

This paper proves that $f$-divergence between two distributions is invariant to invertible transformation (linear and nonlinear) on feature space, and show all invariant integration measures have to be written in the forms of $f$-divergence. We discuss how to construct an invariant structural representation of an utterance by using $f$-divergences. We compare the recognition performance of several well-known forms of $f$-divergences through speech recognition experiments. The results show that Bhattacharyya distances and symmetric KL-divergence achieve the best performance. It is noted that the invariance of $f$-divergence is very general, and doesn’t limit to speech signal. The proposed theories may have applications in other pattern analysis and recognition tasks.
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