

A DEEP LEARNING LOSS FUNCTION BASED ON AUDITORY POWER COMPRESSION FOR SPEECH ENHANCEMENT

Tianrui Wang, Weibin Zhu

Institute of Information Science, Beijing Jiaotong University, Beijing, China

ABSTRACT

Deep learning has been widely applied to speech enhancement. While testing the effectiveness of networks, researchers are also exploring the improvement of the loss function. Although the existing methods have considered the auditory characteristics of speech or the reasonable expression of signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), the correlation with the auditory evaluation score and the applicability of the calculation for gradient still need to be improved. In this paper, an SNR based on auditory power compression loss function is proposed. The experimental results show that the overall correlation between the proposed method and objective speech intelligibility indexes is better than other loss functions. For a same speech enhancement model, the training effect of the proposed method is also better than the comparison ones.

Index Terms— Deep Learning, Loss function, Speech Enhancement, Objective Intelligibility

1. INTRODUCTION

Speech enhancement aims to improve speech quality by using various algorithms. Recently, deep learning approaches have been widely applied and achieved significant results. Generally, those loss functions used in deep networks are constructed based on the distance between the predicted and referenced speech [1, 2]. [3] proposed the scale-invariant SNR (SI-SNR). It evaluates speech quality by a reasonable expression of SNR, which is a widely used method [4, 5]. And it's necessary to introduce the auditory effect into the loss functions. The basic idea is to simulate the perceptual characteristics of the human ear [6], and to implement nonlinear warp of frequency and compression of magnitude [7]. [8] proposed extended short-time objective intelligibility (ESTOI) based on STOI [9, 10]. [11] introduced the perceptual evaluation of speech quality (PESQ) [12], and combined with the mean square error (MSE) in the logarithmic power spectra (LogMSE) to form the perceptual metric for speech quality evaluation (PMSQE). [13, 14] use the power exponent to compress the value of each component in their loss functions.

Subjective evaluation consumes too many resources. PESQ suggested by ITU-T P.862 [12] become the main

scheme to objectively measure the quality of speech. After analyzing the loss functions such as MSE, PMSQE, SI-SNR, and STOI, we find that the correlation coefficients [15] between these methods and PESQ are lower than 0.9. During training, PMSQE and STOI will make the model be inclined to the corresponding indexes. When the performance of the model is improved, the guiding effect of SI-SNR will deteriorate. Therefore, a signal-to-noise ratio based on the auditory power compression (APC-SNR) loss function is proposed. Firstly, the auditory power exponents are mapped back to the power spectrum. Secondly, the exponent operation in the power spectrum is converted into the scaling factor in the time-frequency (T-F) spectrum. Finally, we refer to the SNR representation method of time-domain SI-SNR to calculate the loss in the compressed spectrum. The experimental results show that the proposed method has a good correlation with most speech quality evaluation indexes. And it can make the comprehensive performance of the model better.

2. RELATED WORK

2.1. Scale-invariant signal-to-noise ratio

The SI-SNR [3] is defined as,

$$\begin{cases} s_{\text{target}} &:= (\langle \hat{s}, s \rangle \cdot s) / \|s\|^2 \\ e_{\text{noise}} &:= s - s_{\text{target}} \\ \text{SI-SNR} &:= 10 \log_{10} (\|s_{\text{target}}\|^2 / \|e_{\text{noise}}\|^2) \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where s and \hat{s} represent the referenced and the enhanced time-domain signal respectively. $\|s\|^2 = \langle s, s \rangle$ represents the energy of signal. Measurement in time-domain can take into account both magnitude and phase as shown in Fig.1(a).

2.2. Perceptual metric for speech quality evaluation

The first step of PMSQE [11] or PESQ [12] is level alignment:

$$\tilde{x}_t = x_t \cdot P_c \cdot T / \sum_t (g^T \cdot x_t) \quad (2)$$

where T is the number of frames. x_t is the t -th frame of the power spectrum. g is a spectral weighting mask and P_c is a power correction factor. Then the power spectrum is mapped to the Bark spectrum by transformation matrix $H \in \mathbb{R}^{F \times Q}$,

$$b_t = \tilde{x}_t \cdot H \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{b}_t = [B_{t,1}, \dots, B_{t,q}]^\top$, $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times F}$, Q and F are the dimensions of the Bark and power spectra respectively. Then Bark spectra are transferred to loudness spectra as,

$$S_{t,q} = s_l \cdot \left(\frac{P_0(q)}{0.5} \right)^{\gamma_q} \cdot \left[\left(0.5 + 0.5 \frac{B_{t,q}}{P_0(q)} \right)^{\gamma_q} - 1 \right] \quad (4)$$

where s_l is a scaling factor, $P_0(q)$ is the absolute auditory threshold for the q -th Bark band, and each Bark band has a corresponding invariable γ_q [16]. Then, PESQ and PMSQE measure the difference between enhanced and referenced loudness spectra. PMSQE simplify the computation of the symmetrical disturbance vector proposed in PESQ by applying a center-clipping operator as,

$$\mathbf{d}_t^{(s)} = \max(|\mathbf{s}_t - \hat{\mathbf{s}}_t| - 0.25 \cdot \min(\mathbf{s}_t, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_t), \mathbf{0}) \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{s}_t = [S_{t,1}, \dots, S_{t,q}]^\top$ and $\hat{\mathbf{s}}_t = [\hat{S}_{t,1}, \dots, \hat{S}_{t,q}]^\top$ represent the referenced and enhanced spectra. $|\cdot|$, $\min(\cdot)$, and $\max(\cdot)$ are element-wise operations. The asymmetric disturbance is obtained as $\mathbf{d}_t^{(a)} = \mathbf{d}_t^{(s)} \odot \mathbf{r}_t$, where \odot represents element-wise multiplication, $\mathbf{r}_t = [R_{t,1}, \dots, R_{t,q}]^\top$ is computed from referenced $B_{t,q}$ and enhanced $\hat{B}_{t,q}$ as follows,

$$R_{t,q} = \left((B_{t,q} + \rho) / (\hat{B}_{t,q} + \rho) \right)^\lambda \quad (6)$$

ρ and λ are 50 and 1.2. Symmetric disturbance and asymmetric disturbance measurement are calculated as follows,

$$D_t^{(s)} = \|\mathbf{w}\|_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \|\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{d}_t^{(s)}\|_2 \quad (7)$$

$$D_t^{(a)} = \|\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{d}_t^{(a)}\|_1 = \mathbf{w}^\top \cdot \mathbf{d}_t^{(a)} \quad (8)$$

where \mathbf{w} is a vector filled with weights for the width of the Bark band. Finally, PMSQE introduces LogMSE as,

$$L = \frac{1}{T} \sum_t \left(\frac{1}{F} \sum_f \frac{1}{\delta_f^2} \left(\log \frac{|X_{x,f}|^2}{|\hat{X}_{t,f}|^2} \right)^2 + \alpha D_t^{(s)} + \beta D_t^{(a)} \right) \quad (9)$$

where $|X_{x,f}|^2$ and $|\hat{X}_{t,f}|^2$ are the reference and enhanced power spectra. δ_f is the standard deviation of log-power spectrum. α and β are factors.


3. PROPOSED METHOD

3.1. Scale-invariant signal-to-noise ratio in T-F spectrum

The SNR expression of (1) is migrated to the T-F spectrum:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{x}_{\text{target}} &:= (\langle \hat{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \cdot \mathbf{x}) / \|\mathbf{x}\|^2 \\ \mathbf{e}_{\text{noise}} &:= \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_{\text{target}} \\ \text{SI-SNR}_{\text{TF}} &:= 10 \log_{10} (\|\mathbf{x}_{\text{target}}\|^2 / \|\mathbf{e}_{\text{noise}}\|^2) \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ and \mathbf{x} represent the enhanced and referenced time-frequency spectra respectively. And we reshape $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times 2F}$ to $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times 2TF}$ during the calculation. As shown in Fig.1(b), different from the time-domain, the SI-SNR_{TF} can only focus on the phase, so the effect will be far worse than the SI-SNR in time-domain. We will introduce the scaling calculated based on the magnitude to compensate for the magnitude insensitivity. In the T-F spectrum, we can make the loss function focus on the magnitude and phase more controllable.



(a) SI-SNR in the time-domain (b) SI-SNR in the T-F domain

Fig. 1. SI-SNR in the different domains. S_x and S_n represent noisy and noise waveform respectively. r and i represent the real and imaginary axis respectively.

3.2. Auditory power compression

Auditory loudness spectrum (4) is the core of PMSQE and PESQ, so we expand the formula (4) as,

$$S_{t,q} = s_l \cdot [(P_0(q) + B_{t,q})^{\gamma_q} - (2 \cdot P_0(q))^{\gamma_q}] \quad (11)$$

The abstract formula becomes easier to explain. The loudness conversion mainly calculates the distance between the power of each band and the absolute auditory threshold under the action of γ_q in the Bark spectra. Since we use it in the loss function, we need to consider its gradient,

$$\frac{\partial S_{t,q}}{\partial B_{t,q}} = s_l \cdot \gamma_q \cdot (P_0(q) + B_{t,q})^{\gamma_q - 1} \quad (12)$$

where γ_q is a constant in $[0.23, 0.27]$. $P_0(q)$ is a constant in $[0.251189, 51286152]$. The maximum multiple between different $P_0(q)$ can reach 200 million. It is easy to make a large deviation of gradient between different subbands with an exponential about -0.77 . The difference of gradient and masking effect (5) can easily make the model unbalanced in training. Using the Zwicker exponentials without the absolute auditory thresholds could also endow different subbands with auditory characteristic differences. So we simplify the loudness expression (11) to,

$$\tilde{S}_{t,q} = (B_{t,q} + \epsilon)^{\gamma_q} \quad (13)$$

where ϵ is set to prevent the base number from zero.

The second problem is the gradient blur. Let's return to the formula (3), where \mathbf{H} is a sparse zero-one matrix. It aims to calculate the sum of the specified subbands and obtain the Bark subband. It will cause the gradient of some (up to 25) bins to become the same when the gradient is propagated back, resulting in gradient blur.

So we map the Zwicker auditory effect exponentials $\gamma = [\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_q]$ to the power spectrum $\tilde{\gamma} = [\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_f]$ according to the correspondence between the Bark bands and power bands [16]. Then we change the Bark spectrum $\tilde{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times Q}$ in formula (13) to the power spectrum $\tilde{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times F}$, and the auditory expression is changed to,

$$\tilde{S} = [(x_r^2 + x_i^2) + \epsilon]^{\tilde{\gamma}} \quad (14)$$

where x_r and x_i represent the real and imaginary part of the T-F spectrum respectively.

To avoid the absence of phase, we convert the exponential operation of the power spectrum into the scaling relationship λ of the real and imaginary part in the T-F spectrum. And the auditory expression \tilde{S} is changed to $\tilde{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times 2F}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{S}_r &= x_r \odot \lambda \\ \tilde{S}_i &= x_i \odot \lambda \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where $\tilde{S}_r \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times F}$ and $\tilde{S}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times F}$ represent the real and imaginary part of auditory expression \tilde{S} . $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times F}$ is a scaling factor computed by $[(x_r^2 + x_i^2) + \epsilon]^{\frac{\tilde{\gamma}-1}{2}}$.

In order to prevent the difference of scaling between different bins become too large. A limiting threshold θ is set to change the value less than θ to θ ,

$$\lambda_{t,f} = \begin{cases} \lambda_{t,f} & , \theta \leq \lambda_{t,f} \leq 1 \\ \theta & , \lambda_{t,f} < \theta \end{cases} \quad \text{s.t. } \theta \in [0, 1] \quad (16)$$

Finally, we measure the loss by formula (10) in compressed spectra \tilde{S} . A signal-to-noise ratio loss function based on auditory power compression (APC-SNR) is obtained,

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{S}_{\text{target}} &:= (\langle \tilde{S}, \tilde{S}_{\text{ref}} \rangle \cdot \tilde{S}_{\text{ref}}) / \|\tilde{S}_{\text{ref}}\|^2 \\ \tilde{S}_{\text{noise}} &:= \tilde{S} - \tilde{S}_{\text{target}} \\ \text{APC-SNR} &:= 10 \log_{10} (\|\tilde{S}_{\text{target}}\|^2 / \|\tilde{S}_{\text{noise}}\|^2) \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

where \tilde{S} and \tilde{S}_{ref} represent enhanced and referenced spectra, and their λ is calculated from themselves respectively.

4. EXPERIMENTS

4.1. Data and model

We used the speech and noise in DNS-Challenge [17] to generate a total of 200 hours noisy speech. The SNR was between -5dB and 20dB . We shifted pitch between -2 and 2 semitones by pysox [18]. Data was then divided into training and validation at $4 : 1$. A total of 38 hours of audio were generated for testing. The SNR of the test set was between -10dB and 30dB , and the pitch shift was between -2 and 2 semitones. The speech for the test did not participate in the training or validation, and the noises were from ESC-50 [19].

The model used in our experiment is similar to the baseline system in DNS-challenge [13, 20]. The overall framework is shown in Fig.2. We used the short-time Fourier

transform (STFT) and its inversion (iSTFT) with 32ms Hanning window and 50% overlap. The magnitude spectrum was taken as the input. The model is mainly composed of fully-connected layer (FC) and gated recurrent units (GRUs) [21]. Rectified linear unit (ReLU) [22] is used as activations except for the last layer. Sigmoid activation [23] is used to predict the gain mask. The result is obtained by the noisy T-F spectrum multiplied by the gain mask.




Fig. 2. The framework of model and loss function.

4.2. Training setup and comparison methods

The calculation is divided into cases **A** or **B** in Fig.2. If the loss is calculated in the T-F spectrum, operation **A** will be performed. If it is calculated in the time-domain, operation **B** will be performed. The optimizer is Adam [24]. And the learning rate is initialized to 10^{-3} , which is decayed to 50% when the validation loss plateaued for 5 epochs. The training is stopped if the validation loss plateaued for 20 epochs.

Four advanced methods are utilized for comparison. **MSE**: MSE is the most traditional method. It's calculated on the T-F spectra. **STOI**: STOI measures correlation on octave spectra, it's more sensitive to the delay. **PMSQE**: PMSQE has been described in section 2. We decomposed PMSQE into PMSQE1 (formula 9 without LogMSE) and LogMSE during correlation analysis, because their value ranges are quite different. **SI-SNR**: SI-SNR can measure both magnitude and phase. It has been described in section 2.

4.3. Correlation analysis

We calculated all methods on the test set. Table.1 shows the correlation coefficient between different indexes. It can be observed that the overall correlation between the proposed method and other indexes is better than other methods. We also additionally tested the MSE after compression (APC-MSE). From the correlation results, APC-MSE is better than MSE, which also proves the effectiveness of auditory compression.

We drew the distribution of each loss and PESQ in Fig.3. The larger value of the loss, the smaller value of PESQ. It can be seen that STOI, PMSQE1, and LogMSE become insensitive with the decrease of PESQ. MSE is insensitive on both sides. SI-SNR has a more stable downward trend with the increase of PESQ, and the tail of the insensitive area is smaller. So SI-SNR can achieve good results although it converges slowly. For the proposed APC-SNR, its variance is




Fig. 3. Distribution of each loss with PESQ.

small, and the insensitiveness of the head and tail are weakened. It's more sensitive to speech quality and more suitable for training.

Table 1. Correlation coefficient between different indexes.

	PESQ	STOI	PMSQE1	LogMSE	MSE	SI-SNR
STOI	0.71	-	0.86	0.71	0.47	0.80
PMSQE1	0.87	0.86	-	0.79	0.49	0.87
LogMSE	0.65	0.71	0.79	-	0.43	0.68
MSE	0.40	0.47	0.49	0.43	-	0.51
SI-SNR	0.88	0.80	0.87	0.68	0.51	-
APC-MSE	0.50	0.60	0.61	0.60	0.94	0.59
APC-SNR	0.91	0.83	0.91	0.74	0.52	0.99

4.4. Training results and discussion

The objective evaluation of speech quality in most studies was based on PESQ and supplemented by STOI and SI-SNR. But due to the different ranges of PESQ, STOI and SI-SNR, we take the average of the standardized values as the comprehensive index (CI), $CI = \left\{ \sum_{i \in \text{indexes}} [(I_i - \mu_i) / \sigma_i] \right\} / 3$. where μ_i and σ_i represent the mean and standard deviation of corresponding index (computed by column elements in table 2). I_i represent the corresponding index. We trained the model by STOI, PMSQE1, PMSQE, MSE, SI-SNR, and APC-SNR respectively. The results are shown in table 2.

As shown in table 2, PMSQE1 can greatly improve the performance on PESQ, but the performance on STOI and SI-SNR are weakened. Because the problems mentioned in section 3 will make the loss tend to optimize the favorable parts for PESQ, and ignore the structural characteristics. And results show that STOI has a similar problem to PMSQE1. After adding LogMSE to PMSQE1, the effect on the PESQ score is weakened, and the other scores are improved. MSE and SI-SNR methods perform well. This proves that the conversion of the auditory domain (no phase) and the introduction of a large number of auditory constants are not conducive to training. APC-SNR shows better performance (CI=0.570) than others. It can introduce the auditory effect without spectral mapping and endow the measurement (3.1) that only focuses on the phase with magnitude difference. It can improve the auditory quality (PESQ and STOI) under the premise of ensuring the original signal structure (SI-SNR). In addition, we combined APC-SNR with PMSQE1 and achieved better results (CI=0.838). We speculate that APC-SNR can compensate for the missing phase and gradient incline in PMSQE1.

Table 2. Test results of models trained by each loss function

	PESQ	STOI	SI-SNR	CI
PMSQE1	2.819	0.915	6.793	-1.067
STOI	2.422	0.942	14.932	-0.337
PMSQE	2.609	0.928	15.538	-0.310
MSE	2.593	0.934	17.098	0.010
SI-SNR	2.638	0.937	17.482	0.295
APC-SNR	2.718	0.939	17.532	0.570
PMSQE1+APC-SNR	2.794	0.940	17.638	0.838

4.5. Hyper-parameters analysis

We also analyzed the ϵ and θ in formula (14) and (16). We tested different θ with ϵ as 1, and tested different ϵ with θ as 0.01. The results are shown in Fig.4. On the whole, six results are concave distribution. The best result is obtained when $\theta = 0.01$ and $\epsilon = 1$. The reason is that θ controls the lower bound of λ , the maximum difference of compression ratio will increase with the decrease of θ . On the other hand, if ϵ is set as a small number, the λ in the region with energy less than $(1 - \epsilon)$ will be very large. If the difference of compression is too large, it is easy to lead to over-fitting. If it is too small, it will weaken the compression effect. So, $\theta = 0.01$ and $\epsilon = 1$ are suitable choices.




Fig. 4. Model results with different values of θ and ϵ .

5. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we proposed a signal-to-noise ratio based on auditory power compression (APC-SNR) loss function for speech enhancement. The proposed method can introduce the auditory compression effect without auditory spectral mapping, and it can measure both magnitude and phase. The experimental results show that the comprehensive quality score of the model trained based on our method is better than other referenced ones. This method also maintains a good correlation with evaluation indexes.

6. REFERENCES

- [1] L. Sun, J. Du, L. R. Dai, and C. H. Lee, "Multiple-target deep learning for lstm-rnn based speech enhancement," in *Hands-free Speech Communications & Microphone Arrays*, 2017.
- [2] Andong Li, Chengshi Zheng, Linjuan Cheng, Renhua Peng, and Xiaodong Li, "Monaural speech enhancement with recursive learning in the time domain," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.09815*, 2020.
- [3] Y. Isik, J. L. Roux, Z. Chen, S. Watanabe, and J. R. Hershey, "Single-channel multi-speaker separation using deep clustering," in *Interspeech 2016*, 2016.
- [4] Yanxin Hu, Yun Liu, Shubo Lv, Mengtao Xing, Shimin Zhang, Yihui Fu, Jian Wu, Bihong Zhang, and Lei Xie, "Dccrn: Deep complex convolution recurrent network for phase-aware speech enhancement," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.00264*, 2020.
- [5] Shubo Lv, Yanxin Hu, Shimin Zhang, and Lei Xie, "Dccrn+: Channel-wise subband dccrn with snr estimation for speech enhancement," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.08672*, 2021.
- [6] R. Vetter, "Single channel speech enhancement using mdl-based subspace approach in bark domain," in *2001 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing. Proceedings (Cat. No. 01CH37221)*, 2001, vol. 1, pp. 641–644.
- [7] Sarmad Malik and Gerald Enzner, "State-space frequency-domain adaptive filtering for nonlinear acoustic echo cancellation," *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 20, no. 7, pp. 2065–2079, 2012.
- [8] Jesper Jensen and Cees H Taal, "An algorithm for predicting the intelligibility of speech masked by modulated noise maskers," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 24, no. 11, pp. 2009–2022, 2016.
- [9] Cees H Taal, Richard C Hendriks, Richard Heusdens, and Jesper Jensen, "An algorithm for intelligibility prediction of time-frequency weighted noisy speech," *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 19, no. 7, pp. 2125–2136, 2011.
- [10] Cees H Taal, Richard C Hendriks, Richard Heusdens, and Jesper Jensen, "A short-time objective intelligibility measure for time-frequency weighted noisy speech," in *2010 IEEE international conference on acoustics, speech and signal processing*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 4214–4217.
- [11] Juan, Manuel, Martn-Doas, Angel, Manuel, Gomez, Jose, A., Gonzalez, and Antonio, "A deep learning loss function based on the perceptual evaluation of the speech quality," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, 2018.
- [12] I. T. Union, "Perceptual evaluation of speech quality (pesq) : An objective method for end-to-end speech quality assessment of narrow-band telephone networks and speech codecs," *ITU-T Recommendation P. 862*, 2001.
- [13] Scott Wisdom, John R Hershey, Kevin Wilson, Jeremy Thorpe, Michael Chinen, Brian Patton, and Rif A Saurous, "Differentiable consistency constraints for improved deep speech enhancement," in *Proc. of ICASSP*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 900–904.
- [14] Liming Zhou, Yongyu Gao, Ziluo Wang, Jiwei Li, and Wenbin Zhang, "Complex spectral mapping with attention based convolution recurrent neural network for speech enhancement," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.05267*, 2021.
- [15] Nahler and Gerhard, "Pearson correlation coefficient," *Springer Vienna*, vol. 10.1007/978-3-211-89836-9, no. Chapter 1025, pp. 132–132, 2009.
- [16] Eberhard Zwicker, Richard Feldtkeller, and Richard Feldtkeller, "Das ohr als nachrichtenempfnger: Monographien der elektrischen nachrichtentechnik," 1967.
- [17] Chandan KA Reddy, Harishchandra Dubey, Kazuhito Koishida, Arun Nair, Vishak Gopal, Ross Cutler, Sebastian Braun, Hannes Gamper, Robert Aichner, and Sriram Srinivasan, "Interspeech 2021 deep noise suppression challenge," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.01902*.
- [18] Rachel Bittner, Eric Humphrey, and Juan Bello, "Pysox: Leveraging the audio signal processing power of sox in python," in *Proceedings of the International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference Late Breaking and Demo Papers*, 2016.
- [19] Karol J. Piczak, "ESC: Dataset for Environmental Sound Classification," in *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual ACM Conference on Multimedia*. pp. 1015–1018, ACM Press.
- [20] Sebastian Braun and Ivan Tashev, "Data augmentation and loss normalization for deep noise suppression," in *International Conference on Speech and Computer*. Springer, 2020, pp. 79–86.
- [21] Junyoung Chung, Caglar Gulcehre, KyungHyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio, "Empirical evaluation of gated recurrent neural networks on sequence modeling," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.3555*, 2014.
- [22] Vinod Nair and Geoffrey E. Hinton, "Rectified linear units improve restricted boltzmann machines," in *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2010, pp. 807–814.
- [23] Jun Han and Claudio Moraga, "The influence of the sigmoid function parameters on the speed of backpropagation learning," in *Proc. of IWANN*, 1995, pp. 195–201.
- [24] D. Kingma and J. Ba, "Adam: A method for stochastic optimization," *Computer Science*, 2014.