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Abstract

In this work, speech rate is estimated using the task-specific representations which are learned from the acoustic-articulatory data, in contrast to generic representations which may not be optimal for the speech rate estimation. 1-D convolutional filters are used to learn speech rate specific acoustic representations from the raw speech. A convolutional dense neural network (CDNN) is used to estimate the speech rate from the learned representations. In practice, articulatory data is not directly available; thus, we use Acoustic-to-Articulatory Inversion (AAI) to derive the articulatory representations from acoustics. However, these pseudo-articulatory representations are also generic and not optimized for any task. To learn the speech-rate specific pseudo-articulatory representations, we propose a joint training of BLSTM-based AAI and CDNN using a weighted loss function that considers the losses corresponding to speech rate estimation and articulatory prediction. The proposed model yields an improvement in speech rate estimation by \(\sim\)18.5\% in terms of pearson correlation coefficient (CC) compared to the baseline CDNN model with generic articulatory representations as inputs. To utilize complementary information from articulatory features, we further perform experiments by concatenating task-specific acoustic and pseudo-articulatory representations, which yield an improvement in CC by \(\sim\)2.5\% compared to the baseline CDNN model.

Index Terms: speech rate estimation, task-specific representation learning, acoustic-to-articulatory inversion.

1. Introduction

Speech rate is defined as the number of speech units per second in a given speech recording. In our work, syllables are considered as speech units similar to the prior research works \([1, 2]\). Speech rate estimation is very important as it is used in many speech-related applications \([1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10]\). Various techniques have been proposed in the literature for accurate speech rate estimation \([13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18]\). These approaches are used to learn speech rate specific acoustic representations from raw speech. A convolutional dense neural network (CDNN) is used to estimate the speech rate. The HMM-based methods are not robust to noise and they require a reference transcription which may not be available always \([2]\). Thus, typically, the speech rate is estimated using only acoustic features without using reference transcription. For example, the approaches presented in \([13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18]\) used the acoustic features for speech rate estimation. These approaches use Gaussian mixture model \([16]\), intensity-based envelope \([15]\), rhythm guided peak counting method \([13]\), smoothed loudness contour \([14]\) and convex weighting criterion \([17]\) for accurate speech rate estimation. Another set of approaches \([2, 18]\) used a temporal correlation and selected sub-band correlation (TCSSBC) based feature contour which involves peak detection with smoothing and thresholding operations. The TCSSBC method is found to be better than the above mentioned approaches. Likewise, many works have been presented in the literature for accurate speech rate estimation using acoustic representations alone. However, the prior works on speech rate estimation did not utilize the articulatory representations, although the motion of the speech articulators such as upper lip, lower lip, tongue, jaw, velum directly encodes the speech rate \([19, 20, 21, 22]\).

In \([23]\), the authors proposed a convolutional dense neural network (CDNN)-based speech rate estimation technique using acoustic-articulatory data. However, direct articulatory measurements may not be available in the test case unlike acoustic signal. Thus, an acoustic-to-articulatory inversion (AAI) model \([24]\) is typically learned for this purpose. In \([23]\), a Bidirectional Long Short Term Memory (BLSTM) network-based AAI model is trained using the input acoustic features and output articulatory features. The predicted articulatory movements from AAI are considered as pseudo articulatory representations which are used as input to CDNN to estimate the speech rate. The CDNN-based approach has been shown to perform better than the TCSSBC approach. However, both TCSSBC and CDNN-based approaches use generic representations such as sub-band energies and Mel Frequency Cepstral Coefficients (MFCCs) respectively. The pseudo-articulatory representations are also generic as they are derived independent of the speech rate estimation task. The generic acoustic and pseudo-articulatory representations may not be optimal for all the speech tasks. Thus, both acoustic and pseudo-articulatory representations need to be learned in a task-specific manner. Unlike the generic representations, the task-specific representations are learned during the optimization of the models that are used to perform the considered speech task. Thus, using task-specific acoustic representations may help in achieving better performance in the respective speech task. In \([25, 26, 27]\), the task-specific acoustic representations are learned from raw speech waveform using one-dimensional convolutional and max-pooling layers (CONVID). In \([25]\), the cascaded CONVID and CDNN are jointly optimized to learn the task-specific representations from raw speech waveform for accurate speech rate estimation. However, these approaches \([25, 26, 27]\) have been proposed only for task-specific acoustic representation learning and does not involve articulatory representations. In this work, we propose a joint training approach to learn the task-specific pseudo-articulatory representations. We also learn the task-specific acoustic representations using the CONVID-based approach proposed in...
In [23], two CDNN models are trained separately using the generic acoustic and articulatory representations. We hypothesize that using the concatenated acoustic and articulatory representations helps in better speech rate estimation as the articulatory representations contain information complementary to the acoustics [28, 29, 30]. Thus, in this work, we use the concatenated task-specific acoustic and articulatory representations as input to the CDNN for accurate speech rate estimation. We further provide an analysis comparing the learned task-specific acoustic and articulatory representations with generic acoustic and articulatory representations.

2. Dataset

In this paper, IEEE-EMA [31] and TIMIT [32] corpora are used for experiments. IEEE-EMA corpus is used to learn the articulatory representations from acoustics. TIMIT corpus is used to estimate speech rate using generic and task-specific representations. IEEE-EMA corpus contains simultaneously recorded speech and electro-magnetic articulometry (EMA) data for 720 phonetically balanced sentences from 8 speakers (4 male and 4 female) at multiple speaking rates [31]. The speech and EMA data are acquired at 44.1 kHz and 100 Hz sampling frequencies respectively. The EMA readings are obtained from 8 sensors placed on different articulators, namely, tongue rear (TR), tongue blade (TB), tongue tip (TT), upper lip (UL), lower lip (LL), mouth left (ML), lower jaw (JAW) and jaw left (JAWL). Each EMA reading has X, Y and Z coordinates which measure the movements in horizontal, lateral and vertical directions respectively in three dimensional space. In this work, we consider the horizontal (X) and vertical (Z) movements in the midsagittal plane forming a 24 dimensional articulatory feature vector comprising six EMA points’ (TR, TB, TT, UL, LL, JAW) X and Z coordinates (6×2=12) and their velocity (6×1=6) and acceleration (6×1=6) components [24]. From acoustics, the MFCC features are obtained using HTK toolkit [33]. For each sentence, the 39-dimensional MFCC features are computed using a window length of 20 msec with a shift of 10 msec. Since, the MFCCs are obtained at a frame rate of 100 Hz and the articulatory features are extracted at a sampling rate of 100 Hz, there is one-to-one correspondence between them. Thus, for a given sentence, the MFCC features have a dimension of M×39 and the corresponding articulatory features have a dimension of M×24 where M is the number of frames. Each subject on an average provides ∼1607 synchronous acoustic and articulatory movement recordings. In our work, we consider the entire IEEE-EMA corpus. TIMIT corpus [32] contains 630 subjects with 8 major dialects. For each subject, 10 sentences’ recordings are available. Each sentence is recorded at 16 kHz sampling frequency. For our work, we consider 8 sentences for each subject, excluding ‘sa1’ and ‘sa2’ sentences resulting in a total of 5040 recordings. In IEEE-EMA and TIMIT corpora, the phonetic transcriptions for all the speech recordings are available, these are used to obtain the ground truth speech rate. The ground truth speech rate is calculated as the number of vowels (as we consider the vowels as syllables) divided by the total duration of the speech chunk. In this work, the speech rate is estimated for a fixed length of one-second duration chunks which ranges from 2 to 8 vowels per second.

3. Methodology

Figure 1 illustrates the steps followed in the proposed approach, which involves three models to learn acoustic representation (CONV1D), pseudo-articulatory representations (AAI) and to estimate speech rate (CDNN). We first present a brief review of each model followed by the proposed approach. For speech rate estimation, we use the CDNN model which has similar architecture as presented in [23]. Speech rate estimation is formulated as a regression problem; hence, mean squared error (MSE) loss is optimized to train the CDNN. The MSE loss between the estimated and ground truth speech rates for a batch of speech chunks is denoted as \( L_{SR} \). The generic pseudo-articulatory representations are learned using a BLSTM-based AAI which is proposed by Aravind et. al [24]. In [24], the BLSTM network has been shown to overcome the problems of capturing context and smoothing techniques and achieves the state-of-the-art AAI performance. As explained in section 2, we use IEEE-EMA corpus to train the BLSTM-based AAI model with three layers (each layer has 256 nodes) to estimate the 24 dimensional EMA points from 39 MFCCs. As the speech rate is estimated for one-second duration chunks, the articulatory points are also estimated for one-second duration chunks. Thus, the input and output of AAI have dimensions of 100×39 and 100×24, respectively. The articulatory representation estimation is formulated as a regression problem; hence, MSE loss is optimized to train BLSTM-based AAI model. The MSE loss between the estimated and ground truth articulatory representations for a batch of speech chunks is denoted as \( L_{EMA} \).

In this work, we propose a joint training approach using a weighted loss function to derive the speech rate-specific articulatory representations from acoustics. The weighted loss function to jointly train the cascaded BLSTM-based AAI and CDNN is defined as:

\[
L_{total} = w \times L_{EMA} + (1-w) \times L_{SR}
\]

where \( w \in \{0.1, 0.2, ..., 0.9\} \). As shown in Figure 1, we use IEEE-EMA corpus which consists of parallel acoustic and articulatory data to jointly train the BLSTM-based AAI and CDNN to optimize \( L_{total} \). The cascaded trained model is denoted as AAI\(_1\)-CDNN\(_1\) (∗ ‘1’ and ‘1’ indicate joint training and IEEE-EMA corpus respectively). Since, the AAI\(_1\)-CDNN\(_1\) model is trained for both articulatory prediction and speech rate estimation, the AAI\(_1\) model predicts the articulatory representations which are optimal for speech rate estimation. The AAI\(_2\)-CDNN\(_2\) takes MFCCs as inputs using which the AAI\(_2\) model predicts the speech rate-specific articulatory representations which are used as inputs to CDNN\(_2\) for speech rate estimation. Likewise, for each \( w \) value, the AAI\(_2\)-CDNN\(_2\) model is trained separately using IEEE-EMA training data. Among all these models, to obtain the pseudo-articulatory representations for TIMIT corpus, we select the AAI\(_2\) model which provides the best performance (using AAI\(_2\)-CDNN\(_2\)) in speech rate estimation for IEEE-EMA test data.

On the other hand, the task-specific acoustic representations are learned from raw speech waveform using CONV1D filters following the approach presented in [25]. To perform the representation learning from raw speech waveform, we first downsample the speech from 16kHz to 8kHz. Then, the speech signal is converted into speech frames of short segments using a
Hamming window of length $w_1=280$ samples (35 msec) and shift $w_2=80$ samples (10 msec). The CONV1D block uses 1-D convolutional layer with $n_f$ number of filters with a filter length of $f_1=240$ and a max-pooling layer with kernel size as $w_2-f_1+1=41$. Thus, the input to the CONV1D has a dimension of $100\times w_1$ and the corresponding output has a dimension of $100\times n_f$ for a one-second duration chunk. The optimum value of $n_f$ is decided based on the performance on the validation data. As shown in Figure 1, for TIMIT corpus, for a given raw speech input $(100\times w_1)$, the corresponding CONV1D block’s output $(100\times n_f)$ and AAI$^1_t$ model's output discarding the filtering and acceleration components $(100\times 12)$ are concatenated and fed to CDNN for speech rate estimation. During training, the CONV1D and CDNN are cascaded and jointly optimized for accurate speech rate estimation, and the model is denoted as CONV1D-CDNN$^{\text{CTSSBC}}_T$ (T ' and 'C ' indicate TIMIT corpus and concatenation respectively). However, we do not update the AAI$^1_t$ model weights to preserve the articulatory information in its output. The CONV1D-CDNN$^{\text{CTSSBC}}_T$ model uses concatenated task-specific acoustic and pseudo-articulatory representations as input and estimates the speech rate.

For TIMIT corpus, we also train the CDNN model using speech rate-specific pseudo-articulatory representations (obtained from AAI$^1_t$) as input for speech rate estimation which is denoted as AAI$^2_t$-CDNN$^{\text{CTSSBC}}_T$. In addition to this, the CONV1D and CDNN models are cascaded and trained for accurate speech rate estimation as explained in [25] which is denoted as CONV1D-CDNN$^{\text{CTSSBC}}_T$. Thus, in this case, the CDNN model uses task-specific acoustic representations. For baseline comparison, we also train the CDNN models using MFCCs (denoted as CDNN$^{\text{CTSSBC}}_T$) and using pseudo-articulatory representations obtained from AAI model which is trained using IEEE-EMA data without having the knowledge of speech rate estimation (denoted as AAI$^1_t$-CDNN$^{\text{CTSSBC}}_T$) as explained in [23]. Thus, CDNN$^{\text{CTSSBC}}_T$ and AAI$^2_t$-CDNN$^{\text{CTSSBC}}_T$ (which is nothing but AAI$^2_t$-CDNN$^{\text{CTSSBC}}_T$ with $w=1$) models use generic acoustic and pseudo-articulatory representations, respectively, for speech rate estimation.

4. Experimental Setup

We estimate the speech rate for one-second duration speech chunks. Thus, each speech recording is divided into one-second duration chunks with an overlap of 0.5 seconds. IEEE-EMA corpus is used to train and validate AAI$^1_t$ and AAI$^2_t$-CDNN$^{\text{CTSSBC}}_T$ models. The IEEE-EMA corpus consists of 8 subjects. From each subject, we consider 80%, 10% and 10% of the data for train, validation and test sets respectively. The AAI$^1_t$ and AAI$^2_t$-CDNN$^{\text{CTSSBC}}_T$ models are trained for a maximum of 40 epochs with early stopping criterion based on the validation loss. TIMIT corpus is used to train and evaluate the CDNN models with different input representations. We consider two experimental conditions to evaluate the CDNN-based speech rate estimation: 1) Seen subject condition - train and test on same subjects and 2) Unseen subject condition - test subjects are different from those used in training. In both seen and unseen conditions, the CDNN is trained for 40 epochs with early stopping criterion based on the validation loss. The seen and unseen subject experiments are explained below:

Seen subject condition: In this case, the training and evaluation of all the models (CDNN$^{\text{CTSSBC}}_T$, CONV1D-CDNN$^{\text{CTSSBC}}_T$, AAI$^1_t$-CDNN$^{\text{CTSSBC}}_T$, AAI$^2_t$-CDNN$^{\text{CTSSBC}}_T$, CONV1D-CDNN$^{\text{CTSSBC}}_T$) are done in a four-fold cross-validation setup using the TIMIT corpus. In TIMIT, 8 sentences are available for each speaker which are divided into four sets. We assign two sets for training, one set for validation and remaining one set for testing. Likewise, the sets are chosen in a round robin fashion forming a four-fold cross-validation setup. Each fold, on an average, consists of around 11575, 5787, 5787 and 5787 one-second duration chunks in train, validation, and test sets respectively.

Unseen subject condition: In this case, similar to the seen subject condition, a four-fold cross-validation setup is used. We divide the TIMIT corpus into 4 sets with 157, 157, 157, 159 number of subjects. We consider two sets for training, one set for validation and remaining one set for testing. Likewise, the sets are chosen in a round robin fashion to form a four-fold cross-validation setup. Each fold, on an average, consists of around 11575, 5787 and 5787 one-second duration chunks in train, validation, and test sets respectively.

Evaluation Metric: The performance of the proposed approach for speech rate estimation is evaluated based on the Pearson correlation coefficient (CC) between the ground truth and the estimated speech rates (denoted as CC$_{\text{SR}}$) [2, 18]. The AAI model performance is also evaluated using CC [24] (denoted as CC$_{\text{EMA}}$).

Table 1: CC$_{\text{SR}}$ and CC$_{\text{EMA}}$ values using AAI$^2_t$-CDNN$^{\text{CTSSBC}}_T$ on the IEEE-EMA test data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$w$</th>
<th>0.1</th>
<th>0.2</th>
<th>0.3</th>
<th>0.4</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>0.6</th>
<th>0.7</th>
<th>0.8</th>
<th>0.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\text{CC}_{\text{SR}}$</td>
<td>0.541</td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>0.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{CC}_{\text{EMA}}$</td>
<td>0.504</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>0.780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Average (± standard deviation) of CC$_{\text{SR}}$ value for TIMIT test data across the four folds in seen and unseen subject conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Seen Subject Condition</th>
<th>Unseen Subject Condition</th>
<th>Input representations to CDNN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIMIT</td>
<td>0.67 ± 0.028</td>
<td>0.51 ± 0.044</td>
<td>CDNN$^{\text{CTSSBC}}_T$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONV1D</td>
<td>0.68 ± 0.022</td>
<td>0.51 ± 0.044</td>
<td>AAI$^1_t$-CDNN$^{\text{CTSSBC}}_T$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAI$^2_t$-CDNN$^{\text{CTSSBC}}_T$</td>
<td>0.74 ± 0.014</td>
<td>0.65 ± 0.020</td>
<td>Task-specific pseudo-articulatory representations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAI$^1_t$-CDNN$^{\text{CTSSBC}}_T$</td>
<td>0.67 ± 0.024</td>
<td>0.51 ± 0.044</td>
<td>Generic pseudo-articulatory representations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Spectra of trajectories of JAW and TT in Z-direction (blue curve) (denoted as JAW$_Z$, TT respectively) (I) Directly measured, taken from IEEE-EMA (II), (III) Estimated using AAI$_1$ and AAI$_2$ for a sentence from IEEE-EMA data respectively. (IV), (V) Estimated using AAI$_1$, AAI$_2$ for a sentence from TIMIT data respectively. The vertical red line indicates the frequency ($f_c$) corresponding to the 99% of the energy of the entire trajectory.

5. Results and Discussions

Table 1 shows the performance of AAI$^2_t$-CDNN$^{\text{CTSSBC}}_T$ in terms of CC$_{\text{SR}}$ and CC$_{\text{EMA}}$ evaluated on IEEE-EMA test data for $w \in \{0.1, 0.2, \ldots, 0.9\}$ in the joint loss function ($\mathcal{L}_{\text{total}}$). It is observed that CC$_{\text{EMA}}$ increases as the value of $w$ increases since the contribution of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{EMA}}$ increases in $\mathcal{L}_{\text{total}}$. Thus, the model AAI$^2_t$-CDNN$^{\text{CTSSBC}}_T$ training focuses more on accurate EMA points estimation than the accurate speech rate estimation. As $w$ increases, CC$_{\text{SR}}$ does not show consistent improvement. However, the highest CC$_{\text{SR}}$ value is observed for $w=0.7$ and we select the corresponding trained AAI model (AAI$_2$) to estimate the speech rate-specific pseudo-articulatory representations for
TIMIT data. On the other hand, the AAI_I model provides the generic pseudo-articulatory representations. The AAI_I and AAI_II\textsuperscript{2} \textsuperscript{(without articulatory representations)} models provide \textit{CC}_{EMA} values of 0.7310 and 0.6893 on the IEEE-EMA test data respectively. \textit{CC}_{EMA} from AAI_II\textsuperscript{2} \textsuperscript{(without articulatory representations)} is less than \textit{CC}_{EMA} from AAI_I, as the AAI_II\textsuperscript{2} \textsuperscript{(without articulatory representations)} model is trained not only for accurate articulatory representation estimation but also for accurate speech rate estimation. We further examine the extent to which the outputs of AAI_I and AAI_II\textsuperscript{2} \textsuperscript{(without articulatory representations)} networks have characteristics similar to those of articulatory movements which are smoothly varying and low-pass in nature [34, 35]. Figure 2 illustrates the spectra of trajectories of JAW and TT in Z-direction (denoted as JAWZ, TTZ) \textsuperscript{(a)} for a sentence from the IEEE-EMA \textsuperscript{(b), (c)} estimated using AAI_I and AAI_II\textsuperscript{2} \textsuperscript{(without articulatory representations)}, respectively, a sentence from the IEEE-EMA \textsuperscript{data (d), (e)} estimated using AAI_I, AAI_II\textsuperscript{2}, respectively, for a sentence from the TIMIT data. The vertical red line indicates the frequency \textit{(f}) corresponding to the 99% of the energy of the entire trajectory. It is observed that, all the estimated trajectories are low-pass in nature similar to a directly measured articulatory trajectory. The \textit{f} values corresponding to the AAI_I and AAI_II\textsuperscript{2} \textsuperscript{(without articulatory representations)} models do not vary much from each other. Thus, the speech-rate specific articulatory representations preserve the original spectral characteristics of the articulators although they are optimized for the speech rate task.

In this work, we use \textit{n} = 32 CONV1D filters for both CONV1D-CDNN\textsubscript{T} and CONV1D-CDNN\textsubscript{CJ} based on the performance on the validation data. Table 2 shows the average (± standard deviation) \textit{CC}_{SHA} values for TIMIT test data across the four folds in seen and unseen subject conditions respectively for the baseline and proposed approaches. It is observed that, due to the supervised nature, the CDNN-based approaches perform better than the TCSSBC approach. In seen subject case, the task-specific acoustic representations provide better performance compared to MFCCs with a percentage improvement of 1.3% [25]. However, in unseen subject case, the learned representations are on par with MFCCs. The task-specific pseudo EMA points provide better performance compared to the generic pseudo EMA points with percentage improvements of 13.85% and 23.33% in seen and unseen subject conditions respectively. Thus, the task-specific pseudo-articulatory representations help in better speech rate estimation compared to the generic pseudo-articulatory representations. The CONV1D-CDNN\textsubscript{CJ}, which uses concatenated speech rate-specific acoustic and pseudo-articulatory representations, performs better than CDNN\textsubscript{T}, CONV1D-CDNN\textsubscript{T}, AAI_I-CDNN\textsubscript{T}, and AAI_II\textsuperscript{2}-CDNN\textsubscript{T} with a relative improvement of 3.79%, 2.50%, 26.15%, and 10.81% respectively. Hence, concatenated acoustic and articulatory representations help in better speech rate estimation compared to using either of them alone. In [25], an analysis on the learned representations from CONV1D is done compared to MFCCs. It is interesting to see the variation in the frequency response of the learned 1-D convolutional filters when the articulatory representations are involved. For this, we observe the center frequencies of the filters used in computation of MFCCs, and those of the learned filters from CONV1D-CDNN\textsubscript{CJ} and CONV1D-CDNN\textsubscript{T} which are illustrated in Figure 3. The log-magnitude responses of the learned 32 1-D convolutional filters in CONV1D-CDNN\textsubscript{CJ} and CONV1D-CDNN\textsubscript{T} are illustrated in Figure 4. The x-axis and y-axis indicate the frequencies and the filter index in the sorted order, respectively. The color intensity variations represents the magnitude response of the filters.

From Figure 3 and 4, it is observed that the frequency responses of the CONV1D filters are low pass in nature and majority of the filters are centred below 1000 Hz unlike filter banks of MFCCs. For speech rate estimation, the primary focus is in identifying vowel nuclei regions [36]. The energy of a vowel typically lies in low frequency regions. This could be a reason why the CONV1D filters learn the speech rate-specific representations which lie in the low-frequency regions. Interestingly, incorporating articulatory representations further reduces the effect of high frequency components and emphasize more on low frequencies. From Figure 4, it is observed that the magnitude of the filters from CONV1D-CDNN\textsubscript{CJ} and CONV1D-CDNN\textsubscript{T} is high in low frequency regions. However, in the case of CONV1D-CDNN\textsubscript{T}, the magnitude of the side lobes is high. In contrast to this, in the case of CONV1D-CDNN\textsubscript{CJ}, the magnitude of the side lobes is attenuated in the high frequency regions. Thus, involving articulatory representations along with acoustic representations, helps in learning better task-specific representations.

6. Conclusion

In this work, we proposed a joint training approach to learn the task-specific pseudo-articulatory representations. We used the concatenated task-specific acoustic and articulatory representations to utilize the benefit from complementary information provided by articulatory representations compared to acoustics. From experiments in seen and unseen conditions, we observed that the task-specific representations provide better performance for speech rate estimation compared to the generic representations. The concatenated acoustic and articulatory representations have shown to provide better performance compared to using either of them alone. From the frequency response of the learned CONV1D filters, it is observed that the filters emphasize low-frequency regions indicating emphasis on the vowel regions. Invoking articulatory representations further helps in suppressing the high frequency components which lead to even more accurate speech rate estimation. Our future work includes estimating the syllable boundaries using CONV1D output.
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