

An investigation of speaker independent phrase break models in End-to-End TTS systems

Anandaswarup Vadapalli

Speech Processing Lab,
International Institute of Information Technology Hyderabad,
Hyderabad 500032,
India
anandaswarup.vadapalli@research.iiit.ac.in

Abstract

This paper presents our work on phrase break prediction in the context of end-to-end TTS systems, motivated by the following questions: (i) Is there any utility in incorporating an explicit phrasing model in an end-to-end TTS system?, and (ii) How do you evaluate the effectiveness of a phrasing model in an end-to-end TTS system? In particular, the utility and effectiveness of phrase break prediction models are evaluated in the context of children’s story synthesis, using listener comprehension. We show by means of perceptual listening evaluations that there is a clear preference for stories synthesized after predicting the location of phrase breaks using a trained phrasing model, over stories directly synthesized without predicting the location of phrase breaks.

1 Introduction

Text-to-Speech (TTS) can be considered as a signal inversion problem: Given a highly compressed source signal (text), we need to “decompress” it back to audio. This is a difficult task as there are multiple ways for the same text to be spoken. Over the past few years, along with the rise of Seq2Seq architectures in neural machine translation and speech recognition, there has been a push towards deep Seq2Seq TTS architectures that can be trained on $\langle \text{text}, \text{audio} \rangle$ pairs without the need for complex sub-systems. However, unlike neural machine translation or speech recognition, TTS outputs are continuous and the output sequences are much longer than the input sequences.

These models effectively integrate out unlabeled attributes such as style or prosody. As a result, during synthesis, explicit control of these latent attributes is not possible. To enable control of these attributes, typical end-to-end TTS systems have to be augmented with a mechanism for capturing such attributes.

While there has been considerable work done towards style and prosody modeling in end-to-end TTS systems [1–9], in comparison very little work has been done for phrase break prediction in end-to-end TTS systems.

In this paper, we present work on phrase break prediction in end-to-end TTS systems, motivated by the following questions

1. Is there any utility in incorporating an explicit phrasing model in an end-to-end TTS system?
2. How do you evaluate the effectiveness of a phrasing model in an end-to-end TTS system?

In particular, we evaluate the utility and effectiveness of phrase break prediction models in the context of children’s story synthesis. We use listener comprehension as a criterion to evaluate the effectiveness of the phrase break prediction models, and their influence on the synthesis output. We hypothesize that using an external phrasing model in the end-to-end TTS system would result in better listener comprehension of the synthesized speech.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows, Section 2 gives an overview of phrase break prediction for TTS, Section 3 presents the phrasing models used in this work, Section 4 presents the end-to-end TTS system used in this work, Section 5 addresses incorporation and evaluation of the effectiveness of our phrasing models in the end-to-end TTS system and Section 6 summarizes the paper and presents our conclusions.

2 Phrase break prediction

Spoken utterances have an inherent structure in the sense that some words seem to group naturally together and some words seem to have a notable break or disjuncture between them. This can be described in terms of prosodic phrasing, meaning that a spoken utterance has a prosodic phrase structure, similar to how a written utterance has a syntactic phrase structure.

Phrase breaks in natural speech are important; they are physiologically essential, help emphasize content, and improve the intelligibility of speech. Phrase breaks can be classified into several levels [10]. They have a non-linear relationship with syntactic breaks [11], and are specific to a speaker [12, 13]. The style of phrase breaks is also a function of the type of text at hand. For example, the phrasing pattern of a speaker reading news text may be different from the phrasing pattern of the same speaker while reading a story book.

The process of inserting phrase breaks in an utterance is called phrasing. In the context of speech synthesis, phrasing is a crucial step. It breaks long utterances into meaningful units of information and improves the intelligibility of the synthesized speech. More importantly, phrasing is often the first step for other models of prosody, such as accent and intonation prediction [14, 15] and duration modeling [16]. Any errors made in the initial phrasing step are propagated to other prosody models, ultimately resulting in synthetic speech

that is unnatural and difficult to understand. This is true even in the case of recent End-to-End speech synthesis architectures that are trained on <text, audio> pairs without the need for complex sub-systems.

Phrase breaks are manifested in the speech signal in the form of several acoustic cues like pauses as well as relative changes in the intonation and duration of syllables. Acoustic cues such as pre-pausal lengthening of rhyme, speaking rate, breaths, boundary tones and glottalization also play a role in indicating phrase breaks in speech [17–19]. However, representing these non-pause acoustic cues in terms of features is not easy and not well understood [12]. In this paper we restrict ourselves only to pauses in speech, and limit our phrase break models to predicting the locations of pauses while synthesizing speech. This is the approach followed in [20–26].

2.1 Phrase break prediction in TTS systems

The phrase break prediction task in TTS can be described as follows: *“Given an utterance (represented as a sequence of words) to be synthesized by the TTS, make a decision at each word boundary indicating whether a break should be inserted after that word or not.”*

Traditionally, phrase break prediction has been achieved by using machine learning models like regression trees or HMMs in conjunction with data labeled with linguistic classes (such as part-of-speech (POS) tags, phrase structure etc.) [11, 27–32]. A lot of effort has also been directed towards unsupervised methods of inducing word representations, which can be used as surrogates for POS tags/linguistic classes, in the phrase break prediction task [22, 33, 34].

With the advent of deep learning as well as techniques for deriving/inducing continuous dimensional representations of words, called ‘word embeddings’, there have been efforts to apply these techniques to phrase break prediction [21, 23–25, 35]. In [26], the authors model phrase break prediction as a sequence modeling task and show experimentally that using recurrent neural network (RNN) models outperforms feedforward DNN models for phrase break prediction. In [36], the authors combine representations from a BLSTM language model with those from a fine-tuned BERT model for phrase break prediction in Japanese TTS synthesis.

3 Phrasing models

3.1 Data used

We used the LibriTTS dataset [37], a multi-speaker English corpus of approximately 585 hours of read English speech designed for TTS research. Our phrasing models were trained using the open sourced LibriTTS alignments¹, created using the Montreal-Forced-Aligner² with the pretrained English model.

¹Available at <https://github.com/kan-bayashi/LibriTTSLabel>

²<https://github.com/MontrealCorpusTools/Montreal-Forced-Aligner>

These alignments provide the locations of pauses introduced by the speaker while recording the utterances, which were used to train the phrasing models. The ‘train-clean-360’ split was used for training while the ‘dev-clean’ and ‘test-clean’ splits were used for validation and test respectively. Since the LibriTTS dataset is a multi-speaker dataset, our phrasing models trained using this dataset are generic speaker independent phrasing models for English.

3.2 Systems built

We train two phrase break prediction models on the dataset described in Section 3.1.

1. A bidirectional LSTM (BLSTM) token classification model using task-specific static word embeddings trained from scratch
2. A BERT model with an additional token classification layer fine-tuned on phrase break prediction

We describe both models below. As has been mentioned earlier, these models are generic speaker independent phrasing models for English, as opposed to the typical phrasing models in literature, which are speaker dependent phrasing models trained on the same data used to build the TTS model. The code to train both models is available online at https://github.com/anandaswarup/phrase_break_prediction.

3.2.1 BLSTM token classification model using task-specific static word embeddings trained from scratch

This model is a bidirectional LSTM (BLSTM) token classification model, which given a sequence of words as input, labels each word boundary with either a B or NB indicating whether a break should be inserted after that word or not. The inputs to the model are word embeddings corresponding to each word in the input sequence. These word embeddings are randomly initialized and jointly trained along with the model on the task at hand, and are thus task-specific word embeddings. The sequence of word embeddings is then passed to a stack of 2 bidirectional LSTM (BLSTM) layers, which extracts contextual features from the input word embedding sequence. The output of the stacked BLSTM layers, corresponding to each input token, is then passed to a simple binary classifier consisting of a dense feedforward layer followed by a softmax. The outputs of the model are probabilities from the softmax layer over the set of possible tags (B and NB in this case). Figure 1 shows the architecture of this model.

This entire model was randomly initialized and trained to convergence using the Adam optimizer [38] and a cross-entropy loss. Table 1 shows the model parameter as well as training hyperparameter values for this model.

During inference, to generate a sequence of break indices for a given text input, a greedy approach is followed. We first run the forward pass of the model on the input sequence, and select the most likely break index (B or NB)




Figure 1: BLSTM token classification model using task-specific static embeddings trained from scratch. Inputs to the model are word embeddings which are randomly initialized and jointly trained along with the model on the task at hand, outputs of the model are probabilities from a softmax layer over the set of possible tags (B and NB).

Table 1: Model parameter and training hyperparameter values for the BLSTM token classification model using task-specific word embeddings trained from scratch

word embedding dimension	300
number of BLSTM layers	2
size of the hidden layer of each BLSTM	512
training batch size	64
training optimizer	Adam [38]
learning rate	0.001
number of training epochs	10

for each input token by applying an argmax over the probabilities generated by the softmax layer corresponding to that particular token.

3.2.2 BERT model with an additional token classification layer fine-tuned on phrase break prediction

This model consists of a pretrained BERT model, with an additional token classification layer to perform phrase break prediction. As we had neither the data nor the computational resources to train a BERT model from scratch, we made use of the Transformers³ library which provides APIs and tools to easily download and fine-tune state-of-the-art pretrained models. We used the ‘bert-base-uncased’ model from the Transformers library, which is a pretrained BERT_{BASE} model trained on uncased English text. Figure 2 shows the architecture of this model.




Figure 2: BERT model with a token classification head. The BERT model was pretrained on uncased English text and was later fine-tuned on phrase break prediction. The dense classification layer was randomly initialized and its parameters were learnt from scratch.

The dense classification layer was randomly initialized and the entire model was fine-tuned on phrase break prediction using the Adam optimizer [38] and a cross-entropy loss. During training, the parameters of the dense classification layer were learnt from scratch while the parameters of the pretrained BERT model were fine-tuned for phrase break prediction. Table 2 shows the fine-tuning parameter values used for this model.

Similar to the BLSTM model (Section 3.2.1), during inference, a greedy approach is followed, to generate a sequence of break indices for a given text input. We first run the forward pass of the model on the input sequence, and select the most likely break index (B or NB) for each input token by applying an argmax over the probabilities generated by the softmax layer corresponding to that particular token.

³<https://huggingface.co/docs/transformers/index>

Table 2: Fine-tuning parameter values for the BERT model with an additional token classification layer fine-tuned on phrase break prediction

bert model name	'bert-base-uncased'
batch size	64
learning rate	0.00001
gradient clipping norm	10
number of epochs	10

3.3 Objective evaluation of phrasing models

Table 3 shows the performance of both models described in Section 3.2 on the phrase break prediction task. We report our results in terms of the F-Measure [39] which is defined as the harmonic mean of precision and recall. F-measure values range from 0 to 1, with higher values indicating better performance.

Table 3: Performance (in terms of the F-measure) of the BLSTM model trained from scratch and the fine-tuned BERT model on phrase break prediction

BLSTM model trained from scratch	0.90
Fine-tuned BERT model	0.92

An examination of the results shows that fine-tuning a pretrained BERT model with an additional token classification layer outperforms a BLSTM token classification model using task-specific static word embeddings trained from scratch.

4 End-to-End TTS system

The end-to-end speech synthesis system used in this work consists of:

1. A Tacotron2 model; with Dynamic Convolutional Attention which modifies the hybrid location sensitive attention mechanism to be purely location based, resulting in better generalization on long utterances. This model takes text as input and predicts a sequence of mel-spectrogram frames as output.
2. A WaveRNN based vocoder; which takes the mel-spectrogram predicted by the Tacotron2 model as input and generates a waveform as output.

4.1 Architecture Details

We describe the architecture details of both the Tacotron2 and WaveRNN models below. The mel spectrograms used for training both models are computed from 22,050 Hz audio using a 50 ms frame size, a 12.5 ms frame shift, an FFT size of 2048 and a Hann window. The FFT energies are then transformed to the mel scale using an 80 channel mel filterbank followed by log dynamic range compression.

4.1.1 Tacotron2 model

The Tacotron2 model used in this work is based on the system described in [40], which is composed of an encoder and decoder with attention. Figure 3 shows the block diagram of this model. We use phoneme sequence in combination with punctuation and word boundaries as input to the Tacotron2 model. This way mispronunciations are reduced and the network learns appropriate pausing through the punctuation. More specifically, the Tacotron2 model learns to insert a pause whenever it encounters a comma in the text.




Figure 3: Architecture of the Tacotron2 model

The encoder takes an input text sequence and maps this into a sequence

of hidden states. The input phonemes are re-represented using a learned 512 dimensional embedding., which is then passed through a stack of 3 convolutional layers, each containing 512 filters of shape 5×1 followed by batch normalization and ReLU activation. These convolutional layers model longer-term context in the input text sequence. The output of the final convolutional layer is passed to a single bidirectional LSTM layer of 512 units (256 forward units + 256 backward units) to generate the encoded hidden state sequence (also called the memory) which is the output of the encoder.

The output of the encoder is passed to the attention network which summarizes the full encoded sequence as a fixed-length context vector for each decoder output step. Our system uses dynamic convolution attention [40], which uses 1-D convolutions consisting of 8 filters of length 21 for the static and dynamic filters respectively, and a 1-D convolution consisting of 1 filter of length 11 for the causal prior filter.

The decoder is an autoregressive recurrent neural network which predicts a sequence of mel spectrogram frames from the encoded input sequence, one frame at a time. The prediction from the previous timestep is passed to through a prenet containing 2 fully connected layers of 256 units with ReLU activations. This prenet acts as an information bottleneck and is essential for learning attention. The prenet output and the attention context vector are concatenated and passed through a stack of 2 LSTM layers of 1024 units each. The LSTM output is concatenated with the attention context vector and projected through a linear transform to predict the target mel spectrogram frame. We use a reduction factor of 2, i. e. we predict two mel spectrogram frames for each decoder step.

All the convolutional layers in the network are regularized using dropout with probability 0.5 while the LSTM layers are regularized using dropout with probability 0.1. To ensure output variation at inference time, dropout with probability 0.5 is applied to the layers of the decoder prenet.

4.1.2 WaveRNN model

The WaveRNN model used in this work is based on the system described in [41, 42], which consists of a conditioning network and an autoregressive network. The conditioning network consists of a pair of bidirectional GRU layers of 128 units each. The autoregressive network is a single GRU layer of 896 units followed by a pair of affine layers and finally a softmax layer of 1024 units which predicts 10 bit mu-law quantized audio samples. Figure 4 shows the block diagram of this model.

4.2 Training details

We train both the Tacotron2 and the WaveRNN models separately on the LJSpeech dataset [43], a public dataset consisting of 13,100 short audio clips of a single speaker, reading passages from 7 non-fiction books. The total length of the dataset is ~ 24 hrs. For both models, we train on a 12,838 utterance subset




Figure 4: Architecture of the WaveRNN model

(~23 hrs), while our validation and held out test subsets have 131 utterances each.

The Tacotron2 model is trained using teacher-forcing (the ground truth mel spectrogram is used as the input for each decoder step). We train using the Adam optimizer for 300k steps with a batch size of 128 on a single Nvidia GeForce RTX 2080 Ti GPU. We use an initial learning rate of 1×10^{-3} which is then reduced to 5×10^{-4} , 2.5×10^{-4} , 1.25×10^{-4} , 6.25×10^{-5} and 3.125×10^{-5} at 20k, 40k, 100k, 150k and 200k steps respectively.

We train the WaveRNN model using the Adam optimizer for 300k steps with a batch size of 32 on a single Nvidia GeForce RTX 2080 Ti GPU. We use an initial learning rate of 4×10^{-4} which is halved every 25k steps.

The code used to train both models can be found at <https://github.com/anandaswarup/TTS>.

5 Incorporation and evaluation of the phrasing models in the End-to-End TTS system

We evaluate the utility and effectiveness of both phrasing models in the context of children’s story synthesis, using listener comprehension. Our hypothesis is that using an external phrasing model in the end-to-end TTS system would result in better listener comprehension of the synthesized speech.

In text, phrase breaks are usually represented by punctuation. Typically, TTS systems insert a pause in the synthesized speech whenever they encounter a comma in the text to be synthesized. As mentioned in Section 4.1.1 the end-to-end TTS model used in this work is also trained to insert a pause whenever it encounters a comma in the text. Given unpunctuated text as input, both models described in Section 3 punctuate the text with commas, and the text with predicted commas is then passed to the TTS system to be synthesized.

We first collect children’s stories text (which is unpunctuated or has minimal punctuation) from the web, and then synthesize them under three different scenarios using the end-to-end TTS system described in Section 4. We describe all three different scenarios below

1. **Scenario 1** The story text is directly passed to the TTS system to be synthesized, without predicting the location of commas in the text. In our results, this model is referred to as ‘No Phrasing Model’.
2. **Scenario 2** The story text is punctuated by the trained BLSTM token classification model using task-specific static word embeddings trained from scratch, and the punctuated text is passed to the TTS system to be synthesized. In our results, this model is referred to as ‘BLSTM Phrasing Model’.
3. **Scenario 3** The story text is punctuated by the BERT model with an additional token classification layer fine-tuned on phrase break prediction, and the punctuated text is passed to the TTS system to be synthesized. In our results, this model is referred to as ‘BERT Phrasing Model’.

In order to evaluate children’s stories synthesized using the three scenarios described above, we performed subjective listening tests. The listening tests were set up as a pairwise ABX task, where two scenarios were compared at a time. In each case, synthesized stories from two scenarios were presented to the participants in a randomized order, and the participants were asked to mark the version they preferred, one story at a time. They also had an option of no preference if they could not pick one utterance over the other.

Text corresponding to 5 children’s stories were randomly selected, and synthesized for each scenario mentioned above, giving us a total of 15 synthesized stories. 25 masters students of IIT Hyderabad participated in the evaluation. All participants were present in a quiet room and used headphones while performing the evaluation.

The ABX tests were hosted on <https://golisten.ucd.ie>. Figure 5 shows a screen shot of the test interface. Tables 4, 5 and 6 show the results of the ABX evaluations between ‘No Phrasing Model’ and ‘BLSTM Phrasing Model’, ‘No Phrasing Model’ and ‘BERT Phrasing Model’, ‘BLSTM Phrasing Model’ and ‘BERT Phrasing Model’ respectively. All the samples used in the ABX evaluations can be found online at https://anandaswarup.github.io/phrase_break_prediction/.




Figure 5: Screen shot of the ABX test interface

Table 4: ABX evaluation between ‘No Phrasing Model’ and ‘BLSTM Phrasing Model’

	% Preference
No Phrasing Model	23.2%
BLSTM Phrasing Model	55.2%
No Preference	21.6%

Table 5: ABX evaluation between ‘No Phrasing Model’ and ‘BERT Phrasing Model’

	% Preference
No Phrasing Model	23.7%
BERT Phrasing Model	58.5%
No Preference	17.8%

An examination of the results in Tables 4 and 5 shows a clear preference for text punctuated using a trained phrasing model before being synthesized, over

Table 6: ABX evaluation between ‘BLSTM Phrasing Model’ and ‘BERT Phrasing Model’

	% Preference
BLSTM Phrasing Model	32%
BERT Phrasing Model	44.8%
No Preference	23.2%

text directly synthesized without predicting the location of commas. This answers the first question posed in the beginning, about the utility of incorporating an explicit phrasing model in an end-to-end TTS system.

The results in Table 6 shows a slight preference for the ‘BERT Phrasing Model’ over the ‘BLSTM Phrasing Model’. This corresponds to the results in Section 3.3 showing that the ‘BERT Phrasing model’ has a slightly better F1 score than the ‘BLSTM Phrasing Model’.

6 Summary & Conclusions

In this paper, we presented our work on phrase break prediction in the context of end-to-end TTS systems, which was motivated by the following questions: (i) Is there any utility in incorporating an explicit phrasing model in an end-to-end TTS system?, and (ii) How do you evaluate the effectiveness of a phrasing model in an end-to-end TTS system?

In particular, we wished to evaluate the utility and effectiveness of phrase break prediction models in the context of children’s story synthesis. We used listener comprehension as a criterion to evaluate the effectiveness of the phrase break prediction models, and their influence on the synthesis output.

We trained an end-to-end speech synthesis system consisting of: (i) A Tacotron2 model; with Dynamic Convolutional Attention which modifies the hybrid location sensitive attention mechanism to be purely location based, resulting in better generalization on long utterances, and (ii) A WaveRNN based vocoder. The Tacotron2 model takes text as input and predicts a sequence of mel-spectrogram frames as output, while the WaveRNN model takes the mel-spectrogram predicted by the Tacotron2 model as input and generates a waveform as output.

In text, phrase breaks are usually represented by punctuation. Typically, TTS systems insert a pause in the synthesized speech whenever they encounter a comma in the text to be synthesized. We trained our end-to-end TTS system to insert a pause whenever it encounters a comma in the text.

We trained two models for phrase break prediction: (i) A BLSTM token classification model using task-specific static word embeddings trained from scratch, and (ii) A BERT model with an additional token classification layer fine-tuned on phrase break prediction. As both models were trained on the same multi-speaker dataset, these are generic speaker independent phrasing models

for English. Given unpunctuated text as input, both models punctuate the text with commas, and the text with predicted commas is then passed to the TTS system to be synthesized.

We collected unpunctuated children’s stories text from the web, and then synthesized them under three different scenarios using the end-to-end TTS system described above: (i) **Scenario 1**, where the story text is directly passed to the TTS system to be synthesized, without predicting the location of commas in the text, (ii) **Scenario 2**, where the story text is punctuated by the trained BLSTM token classification model using task-specific static word embeddings trained from scratch, and the punctuated text is passed to the TTS system to be synthesized, and (iii) **Scenario 3**, where the story text is punctuated by the BERT model with an additional token classification layer fine-tuned on phrase break prediction, and the punctuated text is passed to the TTS system to be synthesized.

In order to evaluate children’s stories synthesized using the three scenarios, we performed subjective listening tests setup as pairwise ABX tasks and showed that there is clear preference for text punctuated using a trained phrasing model before being synthesized, over text directly synthesized without predicting the location of commas. This clearly validates the utility of explicit phrasing models in end-to-end TTS systems.

References

- [1] R. J. Skerry-Ryan, E. Battenberg, Y. Xiao, Y. Wang, D. Stanton, J. Shor, R. J. Weiss, R. Clark, and R. A. Saurous, “Towards End-to-End prosody transfer for expressive speech synthesis with Tacotron,” in *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2018, Stockholmsmässan, Stockholm, Sweden, July 10-15, 2018*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, J. G. Dy and A. Krause, Eds., vol. 80. PMLR, 2018, pp. 4700–4709.
- [2] Y. Wang, D. Stanton, Y. Zhang, R. J. Skerry-Ryan, E. Battenberg, J. Shor, Y. Xiao, Y. Jia, F. Ren, and R. A. Saurous, “Style Tokens: Unsupervised style modeling, control and transfer in End-to-End speech synthesis,” in *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2018, Stockholmsmässan, Stockholm, Sweden, July 10-15, 2018*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, J. G. Dy and A. Krause, Eds., vol. 80. PMLR, 2018, pp. 5167–5176.
- [3] Y. Zhang, S. Pan, L. He, and Z. Ling, “Learning latent representations for style control and transfer in End-to-End speech synthesis,” in *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, ICASSP 2019, Brighton, United Kingdom, May 12-17, 2019*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 6945–6949.

- [4] Y. Lee and T. Kim, “Robust and fine-grained prosody control of End-to-End speech synthesis,” in *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, ICASSP 2019, Brighton, United Kingdom, May 12-17, 2019*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 5911–5915.
- [5] W. Hsu, Y. Zhang, R. J. Weiss, H. Zen, Y. Wu, Y. Wang, Y. Cao, Y. Jia, Z. Chen, J. Shen, P. Nguyen, and R. Pang, “Hierarchical generative modeling for controllable speech synthesis,” in *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019, New Orleans, LA, USA, May 6-9, 2019*. OpenReview.net, 2019.
- [6] E. Battenberg, S. Mariooryad, D. Stanton, R. J. Skerry-Ryan, M. Shannon, D. Kao, and T. Bagby, “Effective use of variational embedding capacity in expressive end-to-end speech synthesis,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/1906.03402, 2019.
- [7] V. Aggarwal, M. Cotescu, N. Prateek, J. Lorenzo-Trueba, and R. Barra-Chicote, “Using VAEs and Normalizing Flows for One-Shot Text-to-Speech Synthesis of expressive speech,” in *2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, ICASSP 2020, Barcelona, Spain, May 4-8, 2020*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 6179–6183.
- [8] R. Valle, J. Li, R. Prenger, and B. Catanzaro, “Mellotron: Multispeaker Expressive Voice Synthesis by conditioning on Rhythm, Pitch and Global Style Tokens,” in *2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, ICASSP 2020, Barcelona, Spain, May 4-8, 2020*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 6189–6193.
- [9] T. Hu, A. Shrivastava, O. Tuzel, and C. Dhir, “Unsupervised Style and Content Separation by Minimizing Mutual Information for Speech Synthesis,” in *2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, ICASSP 2020, Barcelona, Spain, May 4-8, 2020*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 3267–3271.
- [10] K. E. A. Silverman, M. E. Beckman, J. F. Pitrelli, M. Ostendorf, C. W. Wightman, P. Price, J. B. Pierrehumbert, and J. Hirschberg, “ToBI: a standard for labeling English prosody.” in *ICSLP*. ISCA, 1992.
- [11] P. Taylor and A. W. Black, “Assigning phrase breaks from part-of-speech sequences,” *Comput. Speech Lang.*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 99–117, 1998.
- [12] K. Prahallad, E. V. Raghavendra, and A. W. Black, “Learning speaker-specific phrase breaks for text-to-speech systems,” in *Proceedings of 7th ISCA Speech Synthesis Workshop (SSW7)*, Kyoto, Japan, 2010, pp. 148–153.
- [13] —, “Semi-supervised learning of acoustic driven prosodic phrase breaks for text-to-speech systems,” in *Proceedings of 5th International Conference on Speech Prosody (Speech Prosody 2010)*, Chicago, Illinois, May 2010.

- [14] J. Hirschberg, “Pitch accent in context: Predicting intonational prominence from text,” *Artif. Intell.*, vol. 63, no. 1-2, pp. 305–340, 1993.
- [15] K. N. Ross and M. Ostendorf, “Prediction of abstract prosodic labels for speech synthesis,” *Comput. Speech Lang.*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 155–185, 1996.
- [16] J. P. H. van Santen, “Assignment of segmental duration in text-to-speech synthesis,” *Comput. Speech Lang.*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 95–128, 1994.
- [17] C. Wightman, S. Shattuck-Hufnagel, M. Ostendorf, and P. J. Price, “Segmental durations in the vicinity of prosodic phrase boundaries,” *Journal Acoustical Society of America*, vol. 91, no. 3, pp. 1707–1717, 1992.
- [18] L. Redi and S. Shattuck-Hufnagel, “Variation in realization of glottalization in normal speakers,” *Journal of Phonetics*, vol. 29, pp. 407–429, 2001.
- [19] H. Kim, T. Yoon, J. Cole, and M. Hasegawa-Johnson, “Acoustic differentiation of L- and L-L% in switchboard and radio news speech,” in *Proceedings of Speech Prosody*, Dresden, 2006.
- [20] A. Parlikar and A. W. Black, “Minimum error rate training for phrasing in speech synthesis,” in *Proceedings of 8th ISCA Speech Synthesis Workshop (SSW8)*, Barcelona, Spain, September 2013, pp. 13–16.
- [21] O. Watts, A. Stan, Y. Mamiya, A. Suni, J. M. Burgos, and J. M. Montero, “The Simple4All entry to the blizzard challenge 2013,” in *Proceedings of the 2013 Blizzard Challenge Workshop*, August 2013.
- [22] A. Vadapalli, P. Bhaskararao, and K. Prahallad, “Significance of word-terminal syllables for prediction of phrase breaks in Text-to-Speech systems in Indian languages,” in *Proceedings of 8th ISCA Speech Synthesis Workshop (SSW8)*, Barcelona, Spain, September 2013, pp. 189–194.
- [23] O. Watts, J. Yamagishi, and S. King, “Unsupervised continuous-valued word features for phrase-break prediction without a part-of-speech tagger,” in *Proceedings of Interspeech*, Florence, Italy, August 2011, pp. 2157–2160.
- [24] A. Vadapalli and K. Prahallad, “Learning continuous-valued word representations for phrase break prediction,” in *INTERSPEECH 2014, 15th Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, Singapore, September 14-18, 2014*. ISCA, 2014, pp. 41–45.
- [25] O. Watts, S. Gangireddy, J. Yamagishi, S. King, S. Renals, A. Stan, and M. Giurgiu, “Neural net word representations for phrase-break prediction without a part of speech tagger,” in *Proceedings IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, Florence, Italy, May 2014, pp. 2599–2603.

- [26] A. Vadapalli and S. V. Gangashetty, “An investigation of recurrent neural network architectures using word embeddings for phrase break prediction,” in *INTERSPEECH 2016, 17th Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, San Francisco, CA, USA, September 8-12, 2016*. ISCA, 2016, pp. 2308–2312.
- [27] A. Parlikar and A. W. Black, “A grammar based approach to style specific phrase prediction,” in *Proceedings of Interspeech*, Florence, Italy, August 2011, pp. 2149–2152.
- [28] M. Wang and J. Hirschberg, “Automatic classification of intonational phrase boundaries,” *Computer Speech and Language*, vol. 6, pp. 175–196, 1992.
- [29] E. Navas, I. Hernez, and I. Sainz, “Evaluation of automatic break insertion for an agglutinative and inflected language,” *Speech Communication*, vol. 50, no. 11-12, pp. 888–899, 2008.
- [30] H. Schmid and M. Atterer, “New statistical methods for phrase break prediction,” in *Proceedings of 20th International conference on Computational Linguistics, COLING '04*, Geneva, Switzerland, 2004.
- [31] A. Bonafonte and P. Agüero, “Phrase break prediction using a finite state transducer,” in *Proceedings of 11th International Workshop on Advances in Speech Technology*, 2004.
- [32] B. Busser, W. Daelemans, and A. van den Bosch, “Predicting phrase breaks with memory-based learning,” in *Proceedings of 4th ISCA Speech Synthesis Workshop*, 2001.
- [33] A. Parlikar and A. W. Black, “Data-driven phrasing for speech synthesis in low-resource languages,” in *Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, Kyoto, Japan, March 2012.
- [34] N. S. Krishna and H. A. Murthy, “A new prosodic phrasing model for Indian language Telugu,” in *INTERSPEECH-2004-ICSLP*, vol. 1, Oct 6-11 2004, pp. 793–796.
- [35] O. Watts, “Unsupervised learning for text-to-speech synthesis,” Ph.D. dissertation, University of Edinburgh, 2012.
- [36] K. Futamata, B. Park, R. Yamamoto, and K. Tachibana, “Phrase break prediction with bidirectional encoder representations in japanese text-to-speech synthesis,” 2021.
- [37] H. Zen, V. Dang, R. Clark, Y. Zhang, R. J. Weiss, Y. Jia, Z. Chen, and Y. Wu, “LibriTTS: A corpus derived from librispeech for text-to-speech,” in *Interspeech 2019, 20th Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, Graz, Austria, 15-19 September 2019*, G. Kubin and Z. Kacic, Eds. ISCA, 2019, pp. 1526–1530. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.21437/Interspeech.2019-2441>

- [38] D. P. Kingma and J. Ba, “Adam: A method for stochastic optimization,” in *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings*, Y. Bengio and Y. LeCun, Eds., 2015. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6980>
- [39] C. J. van Rijsbergen, *Information Retrieval*. Butterworth, 1979.
- [40] E. Battenberg, R. J. Skerry-Ryan, S. Mariooryad, D. Stanton, D. Kao, M. Shannon, and T. Bagby, “Location-relative attention mechanisms for robust long-form speech synthesis,” in *2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, ICASSP 2020, Barcelona, Spain, May 4-8, 2020*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 6194–6198. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICASSP40776.2020.9054106>
- [41] N. Kalchbrenner, E. Elsen, K. Simonyan, S. Noury, N. Casagrande, E. Lockhart, F. Stimberg, A. van den Oord, S. Dieleman, and K. Kavukcuoglu, “Efficient neural audio synthesis,” in *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2018, Stockholmsmässan, Stockholm, Sweden, July 10-15, 2018*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, J. G. Dy and A. Krause, Eds., vol. 80. PMLR, 2018, pp. 2415–2424. [Online]. Available: <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v80/kalchbrenner18a.html>
- [42] J. Lorenzo-Trueba, T. Drugman, J. Latorre, T. Merritt, B. Putrycz, R. Barra-Chicote, A. Moinet, and V. Aggarwal, “Towards achieving robust universal neural vocoding,” in *Interspeech 2019, 20th Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, Graz, Austria, 15-19 September 2019*, G. Kubin and Z. Kacic, Eds. ISCA, 2019, pp. 181–185. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.21437/Interspeech.2019-1424>
- [43] K. Ito and L. Johnson, “The LJ speech dataset,” <https://keithito.com/LJ-Speech-Dataset/>, 2017.