
Speech Robust Bench: A Robustness Benchmark For Speech Recognition

Muhammad A. Shah^{1,2} David Solans Noguero² Mikko A. Heikkilä² Nicolas Kourtellis²

Abstract

As Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR) models become ever more pervasive, it is important to ensure that they make reliable predictions under corruptions present in the physical and digital world. We propose *Speech Robust Bench (SRB)*, a comprehensive benchmark for evaluating the robustness of ASR models to diverse corruptions. SRB is composed of 69 input perturbations which are intended to simulate various corruptions that ASR models may encounter in the physical and digital world. We use SRB to evaluate the robustness of several state-of-the-art ASR models and observe that model size and certain modeling choices such as discrete representations, and self-training appear to be conducive to robustness. We extend this analysis to measure the robustness of ASR models on data from various demographic subgroups, namely English and Spanish speakers, and males and females, and observed noticeable disparities in the model’s robustness across subgroups. We believe that SRB will facilitate future research towards robust ASR models, by making it easier to conduct comprehensive and comparable robustness evaluations.

1. Introduction

Robustness to input perturbations is a highly desirable attribute in Machine Learning (ML) models. When deployed in the real world, ML models are likely to encounter noise and corruptions arising from a myriad of sources, including the environment, sensing apparatus, and even malicious actors. The ability of the models to counteract these sources of noise and continue to make accurate predictions has significant implications for their safety, security, and reliability.

As novel ML models continue to be developed *and deployed*

¹Language Technologies Institute, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA (work done during an internship at Telefonica) ²Telefonica Research, Barcelona, ES. Correspondence to: Muhammad A. Shah <mshah1@cs.cmu.edu>.

at an ever-increasing rate, it has become all the more important to ensure that their robustness is well understood. To this end, prior works have developed robustness benchmarks that evaluate various aspects of a model’s performance under a variety of input perturbations. These benchmarks have proven to be invaluable to the advancement of research into more robust models because (1) they enable meaningful comparisons across existing and new models, which allows progress to be accurately tracked, and (2) make it easier for researchers to evaluate the robustness of their models, thereby reducing the barrier to entry into robustness research. While robustness benchmarks have been proposed in prior works for vision (Hendrycks & Dietterich, 2019; Hendrycks et al., 2021a;b; Croce et al., 2020) and natural language processing (Wang et al., 2021a; 2022b) tasks, the development of such benchmarks for Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR) models has received little attention beyond benchmarks based on simple digit sequence recognition (Hirsch & Pearce, 2000).

In the absence of standardized benchmarks, prior works have tried to evaluate the robustness of ASR models in various different ways. For example, several works have used a combination of distortions from various datasets to perturb the input audio (Radford et al., 2023; Wen et al., 2016; Chen et al., 2022), however, since the choice of dataset varies among studies, their results are not comparable. Other, more recent, works (Likhomanenko et al., 2020; Radford et al., 2023; Hsu et al., 2021b) have evaluated the robustness of models by computing their transcription accuracy on multiple speech datasets that may have perturbations from the real world. Since the type of perturbations present in these datasets is not controlled and is unknown, this evaluation method does not inform about the specific type of perturbations the models may be weak against. Moreover, prior works rarely evaluate their proposed models against adversarial attacks (unless they are proposing defenses), and thus neglect to highlight potential security vulnerabilities of the models.

In this paper, we propose *Speech Robust Bench (SRB)*, a standardized robustness benchmark for ASR models. Following the design of successful robustness benchmarks for image recognition (Hendrycks & Dietterich, 2019; Croce et al., 2020), SRB is composed of two parts: (1) a comprehensive bank of perturbations, and (2) a set of ro-

bustness metrics. The perturbations bank contains a comprehensive set of perturbations that represent common distortions arising from the environment or equipment, variations in speaker attributes, semantic preserving special effects found in digital media, and adversarial attacks. Meanwhile, the metrics we propose, following the methodology of (Hendrycks & Dietterich, 2019), measure two aspects of robustness: the transcription accuracy of the models, as well as the stability of the predicted transcripts under randomized perturbations.

To highlight the need for and the benefits of doing systematic robustness assessment, we evaluate the robustness of several popular ASR models using SRB, and compare their robustness. We observe that while Whisper (Radford et al., 2023) is the most robust *on average* among the models we tested, it is outperformed by other, smaller, models on several perturbations. Further analyses reveal that larger models tend to be more robust than smaller models, even if the latter are trained on significantly more data. We further extend our analysis by evaluating the models’ robustness for the various population sub-groups, namely, English and non-English (Spanish) speakers, and male and female speakers. We find that significant disparities exist across these sub-groups, thus identifying areas where future work could provide improvements, and demonstrating the utility of SRB in fairness evaluations as well.

To summarize we make the following contributions:

- We present SRB, a robustness benchmark for ASR models, which can result in directly comparable robustness evaluations and facilitate progress.
- We open source our code ¹ with clear documentation of existing use cases and support easy extensibility.
- We release perturbed versions of the Librispeech test set, and the test set of the Spanish subset of Multi-Lingual Librispeech to facilitate out-of-the-box robustness evaluations for the research community.
- We demonstrate the use of SRB by conducting a fine-grained robustness analysis for several popular models. We extend our analysis by using SRB to uncover disparities in the robustness of ASR for various sub-groups of speakers. This highlights the broad utility of such benchmarks to the field of trustworthy AI.

2. Related Work

2.1. Robust Automatic Speech Recognition

Over the years, several techniques have been proposed for making Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR) models robust to input perturbations, such as noise and other signal

corruptions (Li et al., 2014). We can divide these techniques into two high-level categories: i) model-based and ii) feature-based. i) Model-based techniques modify the models to make them more robust. Examples of such approaches include adapting pre-trained models (Yu et al., 2009; Juang & Rahim, 1996), denoising the audio before processing (Mohammadiha et al., 2013; Wilson et al., 2008), and training ASR models on noisy data (Likhomanenko et al., 2020). Since model based strategies generally require access to noisy data (Li et al., 2014), they are most effective if the sources of noise, and/or the exact environment in which the ASR model will be deployed in are known, and one can gather data to represent them. ii) Feature-based approaches, on the other hand, involve developing handcrafted features that are invariant to noise and corruptions in the signal (Li et al., 2014). Several of these features are inspired by biological audition (Kim & Stern, 2016; Hermansky et al., 1991; Hermansky & Sharma, 1998), while others use signal processing techniques (Li et al., 2014). Generally, these methods are designed to extract the components of the audio signal salient for speech production and perception, while discarding irrelevant components (Stern & Morgan, 2012). Consequently, they do not require precise knowledge of the environment and noise distributions. Recently, however, handcrafted features have fallen out of favor, and have been replaced by features learned via end-to-end training of deep learning models on large amounts of data (Baevski et al., 2020; Hsu et al., 2021a; Likhomanenko et al., 2020; Radford et al., 2023). Proponents of these techniques posit that models trained on larger datasets become more robust. Our evaluations in § 4 reveal that there are several input perturbations against which smaller models trained on less data outperform larger models trained on more data.

2.2. Adversarial Robustness

Adversarial perturbations are perturbations that can change the response of a model when added to their inputs, but are either imperceptible to humans or perceptually and semantically irrelevant enough to be ignored by them (Szegedy et al., 2014; Goodfellow et al., 2014). Adversarially perturbed inputs are known as *adversarial attacks*. They can be targeted (aiming to change a prediction to a specific incorrect class), or un-targeted (aiming to change a prediction to any incorrect class, Akhtar et al. 2021). The design of adversarial attacks is determined by the level of knowledge the attacker is assumed to have about the target model. Attacks that assume full knowledge of the target model’s architecture and weights (*white-box* threat model) often use gradient-based optimization techniques (Szegedy et al., 2014; Goodfellow et al., 2014; Madry et al., 2018; Laidlaw et al., 2021; Akhtar et al., 2021). Attackers who do not have any knowledge of the target models architecture and only have query access to it (*black-box* threat model) typically use gradient-free

¹https://github.com/ahmedshah1494/speech_robust_bench/tree/release

optimization methods (Wang et al., 2022a; Andriushchenko et al., 2020; Wicker et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2017; Zhao et al., 2020; Vo et al., 2022). An intriguing property of adversarial perturbations is that they transfer between models (Papernot et al., 2016), and inputs (Akhtar et al., 2021; Neekhara et al., 2019). Our SRB includes two types of white box adversarial attacks: those that generate perturbations specific to each input (Madry et al., 2018), and those that generate perturbations that cause models to mis-transcribe multiple inputs (Neekhara et al., 2019).

2.3. Robustness Benchmarks

Robustness benchmarks have unified robustness evaluations and enabled fair comparisons between various models and robustness enhancing techniques in several domains, including vision, Natural Language Processing (NLP) and ASR. In the domain of vision, Croce et al. (2020) propose an adversarial robustness benchmark and leaderboard based on AutoAttack (Croce & Hein, 2020), while Hendrycks & Dietterich (2019) and Hendrycks et al. (2021a) propose benchmarks and metrics for measuring the robustness of image recognition models to non-adversarial perturbations. In the domain of NLP, Wang et al. (2021a) propose a benchmark to evaluate models under various lexical and semantic perturbations, such as typos, distractors, and word replacements. However, in the domain of ASR, there is a lack of similar comprehensive benchmarks that measure the robustness of ASR models on diverse corruptions. The current benchmarks are often specialized to one (or few) types of perturbations such as reverberation (Nakamura et al., 2000; Kinoshita et al., 2013; Jeub et al., 2009), environmental noise (Barker et al., 2018; Piczak, 2015), and accented speech (Lander, 2022; Shi et al., 2021). While there is some initial work in developing more comprehensive benchmarks (Hirsch & Pearce, 2000), it is limited to relatively simple data consisting of spoken sequences of digits, which lack the complexity of long sentences that modern ASR models are expected to transcribe. Some recent works (Radford et al., 2023; Likhomanenko et al., 2020) have evaluated the robustness of ASR models by computing transcription accuracy on several speech datasets. We find that this evaluation method is too coarse to pinpoint the strengths and weaknesses of the models; for example, Likhomanenko et al. (2020) present the word error rates for three settings: clean, noisy, and extreme, for each dataset, from which it is difficult to determine the kinds of noise or distortions the model has difficulties with. Furthermore, most robustness evaluations of ASR models do not consider adversarial robustness, and thus neglect to highlight potential security vulnerabilities of the models.




Figure 1: An illustration of the processes involved in using our benchmark to evaluate the robustness of ASR models.

3. Speech Robust Bench

3.1. Overview

At a high level our benchmark consists of two components: (1) a bank of perturbations that are representative of various scenarios that the model could encounter when deployed in the wild (§ 3.3), and (2) a set of metrics for quantifying the robustness of the ASR models and facilitating comparisons among them (§ 3.5). Given an ASR model (§ 3.4) to be evaluated and dataset consisting of audio utterances and reference transcripts (§ 3.2), the procedure for evaluating the robustness of the target ASR model using our benchmark involves the following three steps, as illustrated in Figure 1. First, the input audio is perturbed using a comprehensive bank of perturbations (§ 3.3). In the case of deterministic perturbations only a single perturbed audio is produced, while in the case of randomized perturbations we obtain several perturbed audios that are used to test the stability of the model’s prediction. Then the perturbed audio is transcribed by the target ASR model. Since some of our metrics are normalized by the error of a baseline ASR model (see § 3.5), transcripts from the baseline model are also obtained. Finally, the reference transcript and the predicted transcripts from the baseline and target ASR models are used to compute the metrics described in § 3.5.

3.2. Dataset

We have designed SRB to be largely agnostic to the evaluation data to make it more broadly applicable across various speech recognition domains. In principle, SRB can be used with any dataset that contains utterances and reference transcripts, however, we recommend using datasets with high-quality clean audio and accurate transcripts so that pre-existing corruptions in the dataset do not confound the robustness metrics obtained from the benchmark. For this reason, our evaluation in § 4 uses clean speech from Librispeech (Panayotov et al., 2015).




Figure 2: Taxonomy of perturbations currently used in SRB.

3.3. Perturbations

The taxonomy of the perturbations used in our benchmark is presented in Figure 2. The perturbations are of two broad types: 1) non-adversarial and 2) adversarial. The non-adversarial perturbations fall under one of three categories: 1.i) common corruptions, such as white noise, environmental noise, and room impulse response, that may be introduced by the environment or by other sources, 1.ii) semantically irrelevant perturbations such as special effects that may be encountered in digital media, and 1.iii) speaker attribute perturbation, such as voice/accent transformations. The adversarial perturbations fall under two categories: specific and general. 2.i) General adversarial perturbations are designed to be agnostic to the utterance, to the model, or to both. 2.ii) Specific adversarial perturbations, on the other hand, are crafted to cause a specific model to mistranscribe a specific utterance, and, in general, they are not expected to be very effective on other models and utterances.

Each perturbation is applied at 4 levels of severity, which is modulated by adjusting the parameters and attributes of the perturbation. The perturbations and their parameters and attributes are discussed in detail in Appendix A.

3.4. Models and Transcription

Once perturbed, the utterances are transcribed by the (target) ASR model being evaluated, as well as a baseline model. The transcripts from the baseline model are needed to compute the metrics described in § 3.5. In SRB we use DeepSpeech (Amodei et al., 2016) as baseline. Indeed, in principle, any model other than the target model(s) can be used. We recommend using a model that does not exhibit counter-intuitive behavior, such as unusually high error rate on relatively mild corruptions or lower error rate on more severe corruptions, to make results easier to understand.

3.5. Metrics

Similar to (Hendrycks & Dietterich, 2019), SRB measures robustness along two dimensions: utility and stability of

the model’s prediction under input perturbations. SRB measures the utility of the model with the widely used *Word Error Rate* (WER, see § 3.5). When aggregating WER over multiple perturbations we follow the practice of (Hendrycks & Dietterich, 2019) and normalize the WER of the target model by the WER of a baseline model. Doing so penalizes errors on “easy” corruptions more than errors on “harder” corruptions. This normalized metric is called *Normalized WER* (NWER, see § 3.5). Meanwhile, SRB measures the prediction stability of the model by computing the variance in the WER caused by corrupting the signal with multiple corruption samples drawn from the same distribution. We call this metric *WER Variance* (WERV, see § 3.5).

3.5.1. Word Error Rate (WER)

Following the common practice from ASR literature, the WER is computed as the word-level edit distance between the reference and the predicted transcripts, normalized by the length of the reference. The edit distance is computed as the total number of word substitutions, deletions, and additions required to transform the reference transcript into the predicted transcript. When WER is computed over multiple pairs of predicted and reference transcripts, it is common practice to treat all the predicted transcripts as one long text segment \mathcal{X} , and likewise consider all the reference transcripts as a single long text segment \mathcal{R} . This means that the number of substitutions, deletions, and additions for all the pairs are summed, and divided by the sum of the lengths of the reference transcripts. Formally, this can be written as

$$WER^M(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{R}) := 100 \frac{\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}, r \in \mathcal{R}} ED(M(x), r)}{\sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} |r|}, \quad (1)$$

where ED computes the edit distance.

3.5.2. Normalized Word Error Rate (NWER)

Since our benchmark consists of several corruptions, each at several levels of severity, it is intractable to compare the WER of each model for each corruption-severity pair. We therefore require an aggregate metric to summarize the WER for all the pairs. Since all the corruption-severity pairs do not present the same level of difficulty, simply summing or averaging the WERs over all the pairs will not present an accurate picture of the model’s robustness. Ideally, we should penalize errors on easier corruption-severity pairs more than errors on harder pairs.

To incorporate the difficulty of the various corruption-severity pairs, we follow the approach of (Hendrycks & Dietterich, 2019), and compute the Normalized Word Error Rate (NWER). NWER is computed as a weighted sum of the WERs corresponding to the various corruption-severity pairs, where the weight is the inverse of the difficulty of the corruption-severity pairs. Following (Hendrycks & Dietterich, 2019), we use the WER of a baseline model (M_{base})

Speech Robust Bench: A Robustness Benchmark For Speech Recognition

Language	Model	Data (h)	#Params (M)	WER
EN	wav2vec2-large-960h-lv60-self (w2v2-lg-slf) (Xu et al., 2021)	60,000	317	1.8
	wav2vec2-large-robust-ft-libri-960h (w2v2-lg-rob) (Hsu et al., 2021b)	63,000	317	2.6
	hubert-large-ls960-ft (hubt-lg) (Hsu et al., 2021a)	60,000	300	2.1
	wav2vec2-base-960h (w2v2-bs) (Baevski et al., 2020)	960	95	4.9
	whisper-tiny.en (wsp-tn.en) (Radford et al., 2023)	680,000	39	6.4
	deepspeech (ds) (Amodei et al., 2016)	960	86	17.7
ES	wav2vec2-large-xlsr-53-spanish (w2v2-lg-es) (Conneau et al., 2020)	54350	315	6.8
	wav2vec2-base-10k-voxpathli-ft-es (w2v2-bs-es) (Wang et al., 2021b)	10116	94	25.7
Multi	whisper-large-v2 (wsp-lg) (Radford et al., 2023)	680,000	1,550	3.9/5.8
	whisper-tiny (wsp-tn) (Radford et al., 2023)	680000	39	8.2/23.3
	mms-1b-fl102 (mms) (Pratap et al., 2023)	55000	964	15.4/15.7

Table 1: Models used in our evaluations. The model names correspond to the names of their pretrained checkpoints in the Huggingface library (<https://huggingface.co/models>). The abbreviations of these names are in the parentheses after them. Some of the unilingual models are pre-trained on multilingual data but are fine-tuned on only one language and thus can not transcribe any other language. Multilingual models have been pre-trained and fine-tuned on multiple languages so the same DNN can transcribe several languages. The WER of multilingual models is presented as English/Spanish

as an estimate of the difficulty. This way errors on easier corruption-severity pairs are penalized more heavily than errors on more difficult corruption-severity pairs, when the difficulty is measured by the baseline model performance. Thus, NWER can be formally defined as

$$NWER_{c,s}^M(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{R}) := \frac{WER_{c,s}^M(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{R})}{WER_{c,s}^{M_{\text{base}}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{R})}, \quad (2)$$

where $WER_{c,s}^M$ and $WER_{c,s}^{M_{\text{base}}}$ are the WERs of target and baseline models under corruption c at severity s .

3.5.3. Word Error Rate Variance (WERV)

To evaluate the stability of a target model’s predictions with corrupted inputs, we compute the variance over the model’s predictions on repeated random noise sampled from a fixed distribution. We differ from Hendrycks & Dietterich (2019) who use the co-called flip rate, since their metric is only compatible with class predictions, not with sequence predictions as we have in ASR. Instead, we propose to compute the variance in the WER over repeated random samples of corruption. Similar in aim to (Hendrycks & Dietterich, 2019), this yields a metric that measures how much the model’s predictions fluctuate in presence of noise.

Concretely, given a set of utterances $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$, we corrupt each utterance, x_i , with K random corruption samples to obtain $\tilde{x}_i^{(1)}, \dots, \tilde{x}_i^{(K)}$. We organize the corrupted samples into K datasets, $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}^{(1)}, \dots, \tilde{\mathcal{X}}^{(K)}$, where $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}^{(k)} = \{x_1^{(k)}, \dots, x_N^{(k)}\}$. WERV can now be computed as:

$$\text{WERV}(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}^{(1:k)}, \mathcal{R}) := \text{Var}_{k:1 \rightarrow K} \left[\text{WER}(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}^{(k)}, r_i) \right] \quad (3)$$

where r_i is the reference transcript for utterance x_i .

4. Evaluation

We evaluate several recent and popular ASR DNNs (see Table 1) using SRB and analyze the results to uncover fine-grained differences in their robustness to non-adversarial and adversarial input perturbations. Our analysis is two-pronged. First, we focus on the primary goal of SRB, which is to measure the robustness of the models to various input perturbations. As a case study, we use SRB to evaluate the prediction accuracy and stability of the English ASR models as different perturbations are introduced. As mentioned in § 3.2, we use English speech from Librispeech (Panayotov et al., 2015). We extend our analysis by studying the relationship between robustness and various model characteristics, such as the number of parameters and size of the training data. Having considered robustness averaged over the entire population (represented in the dataset), we extend our analysis to the robustness of the models for various population sub-groups, namely English speech, non-English (Spanish) speech, male speakers, and female speakers. Prior works (Liu et al., 2022; Veliche & Fung, 2023) observe that there is disparity in transcription accuracy between sub-groups. Our analysis augments these observations by showing that inter-group disparities in robustness may also exist, and thus demonstrating the utility of SRB in the broader field of trustworthy AI. The Spanish speech is obtained from the Spanish test set in Multi-Lingual Librispeech (Pratap et al., 2020).

4.1. Robustness of English ASR Models

We evaluate the robustness of English DNNs from Table 1 on the non-adversarial and adversarial perturbations in SRB. Figures 3a and 3b present aggregate metrics showing overall robustness of the ASR models along the two dimensions of utility, which is measured by NWER, and stability, which




Figure 3: Overall utility and stability of English ASR models. Panel (a) shows the NWER for English ASR models under non-adversarial and adversarial perturbations, averaged across all perturbations and severities. The green markers and line show the average WER across the two perturbation types. Panel (b) shows the variance in WER (WERV) caused by the addition of random Gaussian noise and randomly selected environmental noise at fixed SNR of 10 dB.

is measured by WERV (see § 3.5 for details on metrics). In terms of both utility and stability, we note that `wsp-lg` is the most robust model on average, followed by `hubt-lg`. This high-level analysis gives us an overview of the robustness of many popular state-of-the-art ASR models. Next, we conduct more fine-grained analyses to better determine under which conditions the models’ performance deteriorates.

4.1.1. Robustness to Non-Adversarial Perturbations

We first consider non-adversarial perturbations. In the following, we measure the robustness of the candidate models under each perturbation and at each severity level to identify potential failure modes.

Robustness vs. Perturbation Type: We aggregate the NWER over all severity levels for the different perturbation types and plot the results in Figure 7 in Appendix B. The trends observed in Figure 3a persist across most perturbations with `wsp-lg` generally having the lowest NWER, followed by `hubt-lg` and then the Wav2Vec2.0-large models (`w2v2-lg-slf` and `w2v2-lg-rob`). Interestingly, `wsp-lg` does not achieve the lowest NWER on 6 perturbations: gain, phasing, resampling, RIR, tempo reduction, and voice conversion, where it is outperformed by `hubt-lg`. It is rather surprising that despite being trained on more than ten times the amount of data, `wsp-lg` is outperformed by both `hubt-lg` and `w2v2-lg-slf` on fairly common perturbations such as RIR, resampling, and tempo reduction.

While `wsp-lg` is, in general, highly robust, the detailed analysis of its robustness, enabled by SRB, uncovers several areas where it falls short.

Robustness vs. Perturbation Severity: We aggregate the NWER for all perturbations at each severity level and plot the results in Figure 8 in Appendix B. We observe that `wsp-lg` achieves the lowest NWER across all severities by a margin. We also note that at severities up to 3, the NWER of `hubt-lg` is significantly lower than the NWER of Wav2Vec models. Finally, we observe that the NWER of `wsp-tn.en` increases drastically at severity 4, even going above `ds`, which indicates that the performance of `wsp-tn.en` is very brittle under severely corrupted inputs.

`wsp-lg` is able to withstand more severe corruptions better than other models.

Prediction Stability Under Perturbations: To evaluate prediction stability, we perturb each utterance with 30 samples of Gaussian noise and 30 randomly drawn environmental noise recordings from the MS-SNSD dataset and compute the WERV. The results are presented in Figure 9 in Appendix B. We note that the predictions of the models are generally more stable against environmental noise than against Gaussian white noise at the same SNR. Most notably, the WERV of `wsp-tn.en` goes from being the second lowest against environmental noise to being the second highest against Gaussian noise. Even the WERV of `wsp-lg` increases significantly against Gaussian noise. In contrast, `hubt-lg` maintains low WERV on both types of noise.

Some models (`hubt-lg`, `w2v2-lg-slf`, `ds`) are more stable on Gaussian noise, while others (`wsp-lg`, `w2v2-bs`, `w2v2-lg-rob`) are more stable on environmental noise.

4.1.2. Robustness to Adversarial Perturbations

We evaluate the English-only DNNs from Table 1 on the untargeted utterance-agnostic perturbations and untargeted specific perturbations. Figure 10 in Appendix B shows the WER of the DNNs on the two perturbations as well as their average. In terms of average WER `w2v2-lg-slf` emerges as the most robust model followed by `wsp-lg`. However, looking at the breakdown by perturbation types, we find that while `wsp-lg` is almost equally susceptible to general and specific perturbations, `w2v2-lg-slf` is much more vulnerable to specific perturbations, but significantly less vulnerable to general perturbations. Therefore, under black- or grey-box scenarios, `w2v2-lg-slf` may be a better choice, while under the white-box threat model `wsp-lg` may be more robust. Considering the three DNNs that are based on Wav2Vec-2 Large: `hubt-lg`, `w2v2-lg-slf` and `w2v2-lg-rob`, we note that `hubt-lg` achieves the lowest WER against specific adversarial perturbations, while `w2v2-lg-slf` achieves the lowest WER against general adversarial perturbations. Meanwhile `w2v2-lg-rob` performs similarly as `w2v2-bs`. We note that: (1) the self-training used in `w2v2-lg-slf` may induce robustness to utterance-agnostic adversarial attacks, (2) the discrete representations of `hubt-lg` may induce robustness




Figure 4: NWER on non-adversarial and adversarial perturbations plotted against the number of parameters (a & c) and hours of training data used to train the DNN (b). Figures (a) and (b) plot all the models, while (c) plots three families of models (indicated by the color). The models within the family share similar architectures, and training datasets.

to specific adversarial attacks, and (3) diversifying training data has little to no effect on adversarial robustness. Finally, `wsp-tn.en` is highly vulnerable to specific adversarial attacks.

4.1.3 Robustness vs. Model Attributes

To determine if the prevailing practice of training DNNs with more parameters on larger datasets is yielding improvements in robustness, we plot NWER against the number of model parameters and the size of the training data of all the candidate models. These plots are shown in Figures 4a and 4b. We note that increasing model size is correlated with improved robustness (lower NWER), however, the effect is more inconsistent and weaker for adversarial perturbations. To further isolate the impact of the model size we control the architecture and training data and plot the NWER of models from the same family in Figure 4c, which have similar architectures and training datasets. We note that larger models are more robust in the Whisper and Wav2Vec-2.0 families, but, surprisingly, not in the HuBERT family. On the other hand, increasing training data appears to have only a minor influence on robustness.

Larger models tend to be more robust, while smaller models, even if they are trained on large datasets, are less robust.

4.2. Robustness for Population Sub-Groups

In the preceding analysis, we considered robustness aggregated over the entire population (i.e. dataset). However, populations are generally not homogeneous, and, thus, the robustness of the model may differ on various population sub-groups. Prior works have commonly analyzed subgroup fairness of ASR models by comparing the overall WER for each sub-group on a benchmark dataset (Koenig et al., 2020). It is possible that models that are fair *on average*, may not be fair under certain conditions. In the following, we use SRB to uncover and analyze the disparities in the models’ in robustness across four sub-groups: English and Spanish speakers, and males and females. We find that disparities indeed exist, with multi-lingual models generally




Figure 5: (a) The average NWER of Spanish only and Multi-Lingual models on Spanish utterances, and (b) The average degradation (across severities) in the WER of `wsp-lg` caused by various perturbations (x-axis).

being more robust for English than Spanish (Figure 5b), and most models being less robust for females than males (Figure 12).

4.2.1. Robustness on Non-English (Spanish) Speech

The overall NWER of the Spanish ASR models under non-adversarial perturbations is presented in Figure 5a, and the NWER for each perturbation is presented in Figure 11 in Appendix B. We observe that `w2v2-lg-es` is the most robust model, followed by `wsp-lg` and `mms`. It is interesting that despite having 33% more parameters and being trained on 10× more data, `wsp-lg` is outperformed by `w2v2-lg-es`, thus *indicating that simply scaling the model and training data is not sufficient to achieve robustness, particularly in the multi-lingual setting*. Extending this analysis further, we measure the degradation in WER of `wsp-lg` on each perturbation when transcribing English and Spanish, and plot the results in Figure 5b. We observe that while the degradation is greater for Spanish under all perturbations, `wsp-lg` struggles particularly on RIR.

`wsp-lg` is not the most robust model on Spanish, and struggles on simple perturbations like RIR.

4.2.2. Robustness and Gender

To measure the disparity in prediction accuracy across genders (males/females), we compute the log of the ratio of the WERs of the ASR model on female and male speakers. We call this measure the Log WER Ratio (LWERR) and formally it can be written as

$$LWERR := \log_2 \frac{WER^M(\mathcal{X}_f, \mathcal{R}_f)}{WER^M(\mathcal{X}_m, \mathcal{R}_m)}, \quad (4)$$

where the $(\mathcal{X}_f, \mathcal{R}_f)$ and $(\mathcal{X}_m, \mathcal{R}_m)$ represent the subsets of utterances by females and males respectively. A positive value of LWERR indicates that the model is biased against females and a negative value indicates that the model is biased against males.

The average LWERR values for English and non-English (Spanish) models are shown in Figure 12 and a breakdown by perturbations is shown in Figure 6. We note that, on average, the models are biased against females, and the bias is exacerbated when transcribing Spanish. From Figure 6a we observe that on clean data the English models are generally weakly biased against females, with `ds` being the most biased and `hubt-lg` the least. `wsp-lg` is an exception in that it is slightly biased against males. The bias of the models diminishes significantly under environmental and Gaussian noise, but, interestingly it is exacerbated (against females) under room impulse response augmentation, and phasing. Perturbations that mask or shift the spectrogram, such as filtering, resampling, and pitch and speech modulation, have somewhat expected results – perturbations that shift increase the pitch or mask higher frequencies tend to increase WER for females, and vice-versa. Interestingly, we observe that utterance-agnostic adversarial attacks biased 4/7 models against female speakers, with `wsp-lg` exhibiting the most significant increase in bias.

The bias against female speakers is more pronounced in the Spanish ASR models. Unlike English models, the bias does not diminish under noise indicating that the Spanish models have considerably less robustness against noise for female speakers. The trends for the other utterances remain the same as the ones observed in English models, except the increase in bias due to the addition of room impulse response is much greater.

To summarize, using our benchmark to conduct a fairness analysis reveals that (1) certain perturbations, like room impulse response and adversarial attacks disproportionately degrade the performance of models for female speakers, and (2) the disparity across genders is greater in Spanish models and input perturbations tend to further exacerbate this disparity.

5. Conclusion

In this paper we have proposed, SRB, a comprehensive benchmark designed to standardize the robustness evaluations of ASR models. To the best of our knowledge, SRB, is the first ASR robustness benchmark that contains long-form speech, and expands the set of distortions to include special effects, speaker attribute modification and adversarial attacks. We present case studies to demonstrate the utility of SRB in evaluating the robustness of ASR models, as well as its potential to facilitate evaluations of other aspects of trustworthy AI, particularly fairness. Our analysis reveals that while the latest large models, trained on vast quantities of data, are more robust than their counterparts *on average*, under certain types of perturbations they are outperformed by smaller models trained on lesser data. Furthermore, our analysis reveals that model size generally has




Figure 6: Log WER Ratio for (a) English, (b) Spanish models under various perturbations. WERs are averaged across severity levels before computing the Log WER Ratio.

a greater impact on robustness than the size of the training dataset, which runs somewhat counter to the prevailing wisdom espoused by recent works (Radford et al., 2023; Likhomanenko et al., 2020). We also use SRB to measure the disparities in the robustness of ASR models on data generated by different population subgroups, namely speakers’ language and gender. We find that multi-lingual models are generally more robust for English speech than non-English (Spanish) speech. We also find that under certain perturbations models may be more robust for one gender than the other. We believe that SRB will enable rigorous robustness evaluations of ASR models in a highly standardized manner that will allow comparisons between existing and new approaches and thus facilitate progress tracking. Furthermore, we also release transformed test sets in English and Spanish to facilitate robustness evaluations for researchers and model developers. We believe that this will make robustness evaluations more prevalent and encourage model developers to consider robustness as a key metric to improve.

6. Impact statement

This paper presents work whose goal is to advance the field of Machine Learning. There are many potential societal consequences of our work, none of which we feel must be specifically highlighted here.

7. Acknowledgments

The execution of this work was funded by the European Union’s Horizon 2020 RIA SPATIAL project (Grant Agreement No. 101021808), RIA ELOQUENCE project (Grant

Agreement No. 101135916) and from the Spanish Project 6G-RIEMANN (Grant Agreement No. 2022/0005420). The authors bear the sole responsibility for the content presented in this paper, and any interpretations or conclusions drawn from it do not reflect the official position of the funding agencies.

References

- Akhtar, N., Mian, A., Kardan, N., and Shah, M. Advances in adversarial attacks and defenses in computer vision: A survey. *IEEE Access*, 9:155161–155196, 2021.
- Amodei, D., Ananthanarayanan, S., Anubhai, R., Bai, J., Battenberg, E., Case, C., Casper, J., Catanzaro, B., Cheng, Q., Chen, G., et al. Deep speech 2: End-to-end speech recognition in english and mandarin. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 173–182. PMLR, 2016.
- Andriushchenko, M., Croce, F., Flammarion, N., and Hein, M. Square attack: a query-efficient black-box adversarial attack via random search. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 484–501. Springer, 2020.
- Baevski, A., Zhou, Y., Mohamed, A., and Auli, M. wav2vec 2.0: A framework for self-supervised learning of speech representations. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:12449–12460, 2020.
- Barker, J., Watanabe, S., Vincent, E., and Trmal, J. The fifth ‘chime’ speech separation and recognition challenge: Dataset, task and baselines. In *Proc. Interspeech 2018*, pp. 1561–1565, 2018. doi: 10.21437/Interspeech.2018-1768.
- Casanova, E., Weber, J., Shulby, C. D., Junior, A. C., Gölge, E., and Ponti, M. A. Yourtts: Towards zero-shot multi-speaker tts and zero-shot voice conversion for everyone. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 2709–2720. PMLR, 2022.
- Chen, C., Hou, N., Hu, Y., Shirol, S., and Chng, E. S. Noise-robust speech recognition with 10 minutes unparalleled in-domain data. In *ICASSP 2022-2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pp. 4298–4302. IEEE, 2022.
- Chen, P.-Y., Zhang, H., Sharma, Y., Yi, J., and Hsieh, C.-J. Zoo: Zeroth order optimization based black-box attacks to deep neural networks without training substitute models. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM workshop on artificial intelligence and security*, pp. 15–26, 2017.
- Conneau, A., Baevski, A., Collobert, R., Mohamed, A., and Auli, M. Unsupervised cross-lingual representation learning for speech recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.13979*, 2020.
- Croce, F. and Hein, M. Reliable evaluation of adversarial robustness with an ensemble of diverse parameter-free attacks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 2206–2216. PMLR, 2020.
- Croce, F., Andriushchenko, M., Sehwag, V., DeBenedetti, E., Flammarion, N., Chiang, M., Mittal, P., and Hein, M. Robustbench: a standardized adversarial robustness benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.09670*, 2020.
- Goodfellow, I. J., Shlens, J., and Szegedy, C. Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples, 2014.
- Hendrycks, D. and Dietterich, T. Benchmarking neural network robustness to common corruptions and perturbations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.12261*, 2019.
- Hendrycks, D., Basart, S., Mu, N., Kadavath, S., Wang, F., Dorundo, E., Desai, R., Zhu, T., Parajuli, S., Guo, M., et al. The many faces of robustness: A critical analysis of out-of-distribution generalization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 8340–8349, 2021a.
- Hendrycks, D., Zhao, K., Basart, S., Steinhardt, J., and Song, D. Natural adversarial examples. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 15262–15271, 2021b.
- Hermansky, H. and Sharma, S. Traps-classifiers of temporal patterns. In *Fifth International Conference on Spoken Language Processing*, 1998.
- Hermansky, H., Morgan, N., Bayya, A., and Kohn, P. Rastapl speech analysis. In *Proc. IEEE Int’l Conf. Acoustics, speech and signal processing*, volume 1, pp. 121–124, 1991.
- Hirsch, H.-G. and Pearce, D. The aurora experimental framework for the performance evaluation of speech recognition systems under noisy conditions. In *ASR2000-Automatic speech recognition: challenges for the new Millenium ISCA tutorial and research workshop (ITRW)*, 2000.
- Hsu, W.-N., Bolte, B., Tsai, Y.-H. H., Lakhota, K., Salakhutdinov, R., and Mohamed, A. Hubert: Self-supervised speech representation learning by masked prediction of hidden units. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 29:3451–3460, 2021a.
- Hsu, W.-N., Sriram, A., Baevski, A., Likhomanenko, T., Xu, Q., Pratap, V., Kahn, J., Lee, A., Collobert, R., Synnaeve, G., et al. Robust wav2vec 2.0: Analyzing domain shift in self-supervised pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.01027*, 2021b.

- Jeub, M., Schafer, M., and Vary, P. A binaural room impulse response database for the evaluation of dereverberation algorithms. In *2009 16th International Conference on Digital Signal Processing*, pp. 1–5. IEEE, 2009.
- Juang, B.-H. and Rahim, M. G. Signal bias removal by maximum likelihood estimation for robust telephone speech recognition. *IEEE Transactions on Speech and Audio Processing*, 4(1):19, 1996.
- Kim, C. and Stern, R. M. Power-normalized cepstral coefficients (pncc) for robust speech recognition. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on audio, speech, and language processing*, 24(7):1315–1329, 2016.
- Kinoshita, K., Delcroix, M., Yoshioka, T., Nakatani, T., Habets, E., Haeb-Umbach, R., Leutnant, V., Sehr, A., Kellermann, W., Maas, R., et al. The reverb challenge: A common evaluation framework for dereverberation and recognition of reverberant speech. In *2013 IEEE Workshop on Applications of Signal Processing to Audio and Acoustics*, pp. 1–4. IEEE, 2013.
- Ko, T., Peddinti, V., Povey, D., Seltzer, M. L., and Khudanpur, S. A study on data augmentation of reverberant speech for robust speech recognition. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pp. 5220–5224. IEEE, 2017.
- Koenecke, A., Nam, A., Lake, E., Nudell, J., Quartey, M., Mengesha, Z., Troups, C., Rickford, J. R., Jurafsky, D., and Goel, S. Racial disparities in automated speech recognition. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(14):7684–7689, 2020.
- Laidlaw, C., Singla, S., and Feizi, S. Perceptual adversarial robustness: Defense against unseen threat models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=dFwBosAcJkN>.
- Lander, T. CSLU: Foreign Accented English Release 1.2, 2022. URL <https://doi.org/10.5683/SP2/K7EQTE>.
- Li, J., Deng, L., Gong, Y., and Haeb-Umbach, R. An overview of noise-robust automatic speech recognition. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 22(4):745–777, 2014.
- Likhomanenko, T., Xu, Q., Pratap, V., Tomasello, P., Kahn, J., Avidov, G., Collobert, R., and Synnaeve, G. Rethinking evaluation in asr: Are our models robust enough? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11745*, 2020.
- Liu, C., Picheny, M., Sari, L., Chitkara, P., Xiao, A., Zhang, X., Chou, M., Alvarado, A., Hazirbas, C., and Saraf, Y. Towards measuring fairness in speech recognition: Casual conversations dataset transcriptions. In *ICASSP 2022-2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pp. 6162–6166. IEEE, 2022.
- Madry, A., Makelov, A., Schmidt, L., Tsipras, D., and Vladu, A. Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- Mohammadiha, N., Smaragdis, P., and Leijon, A. Supervised and unsupervised speech enhancement using non-negative matrix factorization. *IEEE Transactions on audio, speech, and language processing*, 21(10):2140–2151, 2013.
- Nakamura, S., Hiyane, K., Asano, F., Nishiura, T., and Yamada, T. Acoustical sound database in real environments for sound scene understanding and hands-free speech recognition. In *LREC*, pp. 965–968, 2000.
- Neekhara, P., Hussain, S., Pandey, P., Dubnov, S., McAuley, J., and Koushanfar, F. Universal adversarial perturbations for speech recognition systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.03828*, 2019.
- Olivier, R. and Raj, B. Recent improvements of asr models in the face of adversarial attacks. *Interspeech*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.16536>.
- Panayotov, V., Chen, G., Povey, D., and Khudanpur, S. Librispeech: an asr corpus based on public domain audio books. In *2015 IEEE international conference on acoustics, speech and signal processing (ICASSP)*, pp. 5206–5210. IEEE, 2015.
- Papernot, N., McDaniel, P., and Goodfellow, I. Transferability in machine learning: from phenomena to black-box attacks using adversarial samples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.07277*, 2016.
- Piczak, K. J. ESC: Dataset for Environmental Sound Classification. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual ACM Conference on Multimedia*, pp. 1015–1018. ACM Press, 2015. ISBN 978-1-4503-3459-4. doi: 10.1145/2733373.2806390. URL <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?doid=2733373.2806390>.
- Pratap, V., Xu, Q., Sriram, A., Synnaeve, G., and Collobert, R. Mls: A large-scale multilingual dataset for speech research. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.03411*, 2020.
- Pratap, V., Tjandra, A., Shi, B., Tomasello, P., Babu, A., Kundu, S., Elkahky, A., Ni, Z., Vyas, A., Fazel-Zarandi, M., et al. Scaling speech technology to 1,000+ languages. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13516*, 2023.

- Radford, A., Kim, J. W., Xu, T., Brockman, G., McLeavey, C., and Sutskever, I. Robust speech recognition via large-scale weak supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 28492–28518. PMLR, 2023.
- Shi, X., Yu, F., Lu, Y., Liang, Y., Feng, Q., Wang, D., Qian, Y., and Xie, L. The accented english speech recognition challenge 2020: open datasets, tracks, baselines, results and methods. In *ICASSP 2021-2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pp. 6918–6922. IEEE, 2021.
- Stern, R. M. and Morgan, N. Hearing is believing: Biologically inspired methods for robust automatic speech recognition. *IEEE signal processing magazine*, 29(6): 34–43, 2012.
- Szegedy, C., Zaremba, W., Sutskever, I., Bruna, J., Erhan, D., Goodfellow, I., and Fergus, R. Intriguing properties of neural networks. In *ICLR*, 2014. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1312.6199>.
- Veliche, I.-E. and Fung, P. Improving fairness and robustness in end-to-end speech recognition through unsupervised clustering. In *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pp. 1–5. IEEE, 2023.
- Vo, V. Q., Abbasnejad, E., and Ranasinghe, D. C. Query efficient decision based sparse attacks against black-box deep learning models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.00091*, 2022.
- Wang, B., Xu, C., Wang, S., Gan, Z., Cheng, Y., Gao, J., Awadallah, A. H., and Li, B. Adversarial glue: A multi-task benchmark for robustness evaluation of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.02840*, 2021a.
- Wang, C., Riviere, M., Lee, A., Wu, A., Talnikar, C., Haziza, D., Williamson, M., Pino, J., and Dupoux, E. Voxpopuli: A large-scale multilingual speech corpus for representation learning, semi-supervised learning and interpretation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00390*, 2021b.
- Wang, C., Zhang, M., Zhao, J., and Kuang, X. Black-box adversarial attacks on deep neural networks: A survey. In *2022 4th International Conference on Data Intelligence and Security (ICDIS)*, pp. 88–93. IEEE, 2022a.
- Wang, X., Wang, H., and Yang, D. Measure and improve robustness in nlp models: A survey. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pp. 4569–4586, 2022b.
- Wen, W., Wu, C., Wang, Y., Chen, Y., and Li, H. Learning structured sparsity in deep neural networks. In *NIPS*, 2016.
- Wicker, M., Huang, X., and Kwiatkowska, M. Feature-guided black-box safety testing of deep neural networks. In *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems: 24th International Conference, TACAS 2018, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2018, Thessaloniki, Greece, April 14-20, 2018, Proceedings, Part I 24*, pp. 408–426. Springer, 2018.
- Wilson, K. W., Raj, B., Smaragdis, P., and Divakaran, A. Speech denoising using nonnegative matrix factorization with priors. In *2008 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, pp. 4029–4032. IEEE, 2008.
- Xu, Q., Baeovski, A., Likhomanenko, T., Tomasello, P., Conneau, A., Collobert, R., Synnaeve, G., and Auli, M. Self-training and pre-training are complementary for speech recognition. In *ICASSP 2021-2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pp. 3030–3034. IEEE, 2021.
- Yamagishi, J., Veaux, C., and MacDonald, K. CSTR VCTK Corpus: English multi-speaker corpus for CSTR voice cloning toolkit (version 0.92), 2019.
- Yu, K., Gales, M., and Woodland, P. C. Unsupervised adaptation with discriminative mapping transforms. *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 17(4):714–723, 2009.
- Zhao, P., Chen, P.-Y., Wang, S., and Lin, X. Towards query-efficient black-box adversary with zeroth-order natural gradient descent. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 6909–6916, 2020.

A. Perturbation Generation/Application Procedure

Below we provide further details on the implementation of these perturbations.

Gaussian Noise: A noise vector of the same length as the audio signal is sample from a standard normal distribution, scaled such that its magnitude corresponds to a specific SNR, and then added to the audio signal. We use `torchaudio.function.add_noise` to add the noise to the speech at a given SNR.

Environmental Noise : We use the recordings of environmental noises from the `noise-test` subset of the ESC-50 dataset (Piczak, 2015). For each test utterance we sample a random environmental noise and add it to the audio signal at the specified SNR. We clip the noise if it is longer than the speech, and repeat it if it is longer than the speech. We use `torchaudio.function.add_noise` to add the noise to the speech at a given SNR.

Room Impulse Response: The 6000 simulated RIRs from (Ko et al., 2017) are applied to clean recordings and the SNR is measured. The 100th, 99th, 66th, 33rd, and 1st quantiles of the RIRs are computed. RIRs with SNRs between the 100th and 99th quantile are assigned sev 1, those with SNRs between the 99th and 66th quantile are assigned sev 2, and so on. The Table 2 shows the average SNR in each severity level. During evaluation, a random RIR having the given severity level is sampled for each test recording.

Resampling, Speed, Pitch, and Gain Perturbations: The resampling speed, pitch, and gain perturbations were applied using the `Resample Speed, PitchShift` and `Vol` transforms from `torchaudio`.

Echo, Phaser, Tempo and High/Low-Pass Filters: These effects are applied via SoX filters of the same name. We used `torchaudio.sox_effects.apply_effects_tensor` to apply these filters to the audio. The args for each filter are as follows:

- `echo 0.8 0.9 <delay> 0.3`
- `phaser 0.6 0.8 3 <decay> 2 '-t'`
- `Tempo <factor> 30`
- `sinc <lo-freq>`
- `sinc 0-<hi-freq>`

Voice Conversion We use use YourTTS (Casanova et al., 2022) from Coqui.ai² to synthesize audio from textual transcripts in a given speaker’s style. The transcripts from the test clean subset of LibriSpeech are used. The target speakers are drawn from the VCTK corpus (Yamagishi et al., 2019), which contains accented speech from 12 accents. For each transcript a random speaker is chosen to synthesize the audio.

Untargeted Adversarial Attack: The adversarial perturbations are computed using an *untargeted* PGD adversarial attack. The attack is computed as follows. First, the maximum possible L2 norm of the noise is determined by solving the equation for SNR for the norm of the noise.

$$\text{SNR} = 20 \log_{10} \left(\frac{\|x\|_2}{\|\delta\|_2} \right) \quad (5)$$

$$\epsilon_{\text{SNR}} = \|\delta\|_2 = 10^{-\frac{\text{SNR}}{20}} \|x\|_2, \quad (6)$$

where δ is the noise, x is the audio signal and SNR is the upper bound on the SNR in the final signal. Then, we follow the approach of (Madry et al., 2018) and optimize δ using Projected Gradient Descent (PGD) to maximize the divergence between the true and predicted transcriptions.

²<https://github.com/coqui-ai/TTS>

Speech Robust Bench: A Robustness Benchmark For Speech Recognition

Perturbation	Sev 1	Sev 2	Sev 3	Sev 4
Gaussian Noise	10 dB	5 dB	1 dB	-10 dB
Environmental Noise	10 dB	5 dB	1 dB	-10 dB
RIR	2.66 dB	-1.48 dB	-2.82 dB	-4.10 dB
Resampling	0.75x	0.5x	0.25x	0.125x
Speed-up	1.25x	1.5x	1.75x	2x
Slow-down	0.875x	0.75	0.625x	0.5x
tempo-up	1.25x	1.5x	1.75x	2x
tempo-down	0.875x	0.75	0.625x	0.5x
Pitch Step-up	0.25 oct	0.5 oct	0.75 oct	1 oct
Pitch Step-down	0.25 oct	0.5 oct	0.75 oct	1 oct
Gain (factor)	10x	20x	30x	40x
Echo (delay)	125 ms	250 ms	500 ms	1000 ms
Phaser (decay)	0.3 s	0.5 s	0.7 s	0.9 s
Low-pass filter	4 kHz	2833 kHz	1666 kHz	500 kHz
High-pass filter	500 kHz	1333 kHz	2166 kHz	3000 kHz
Voice Conversion	N/A			
PGD Attack	40 dB	30 dB	20 dB	10dB
Utterance Agnostic Attack	40 dB	30 dB	20 dB	10dB

Table 2: The parameters defining the various severity levels of the perturbations used in the proposed benchmark.

Untargeted Utterance Agnostic Adversarial Attack: We use the method of (Neekhara et al., 2019) to compute utterance agnostic adversarial perturbations. Concretely, we compute a single perturbation vector that can cause the accuracy of the model on several (ideally all) inputs to degrade severely. The main difference between the universal attack and the PGD attack is that the latter computes a perturbation vector for each input, whereas the former computes a single perturbation that is expected to successfully attack any input to the model. Once we compute the perturbation we add it to the audio signal at the specified SNR.

We use the `robust_speech` package (Olivier & Raj, 2022) to generate adversarial perturbations.

$$\delta = \max_{\hat{\delta}: \|\hat{\delta}\|_2 \leq \epsilon_{\text{SNR}}} D(h_{\hat{\delta}}, r) \tag{7}$$

B. Fine Grained Analyses

The following figures present fine-grained analyses of robustness. These figures may be referenced by the main text but were not included in the main body in the interest of space. Figures 7, and 11 present the breakdown by perturbation of the robustness of models on English and Spanish, respectively. Figure 9 presents a similar breakdown for prediction stability of the models, while Figure 8 presents a breakdown of robustness by severity. Figure 10 presents the robustness of models to adversarial attacks.




Figure 7: NWER of the models on different augmentations, averaged over all severities.




Figure 8: NWER as the severity of the augmentation is increased.




Figure 9: The WERV of various models under Gaussian noise and environmental noise of SNR 10 dB




Figure 10: The WER of the various models under general (blue) and specific (orange) adversarial perturbations. The green markers and line show the average WER on both perturbation types.




Figure 11: The NWER of Spanish only and Multi-Lingual models on Spanish utterances under various perturbations.




Figure 12: Log WER Ratio between male and female speakers from Librispeech (English) (a) and Spanish Multilingual Librispeech (b).