

End-to-End User-Defined Keyword Spotting using Shifted Delta Coefficients

Kesavaraj V, Anuprabha M, Anil Kumar Vuppala

Speech Processing Laboratory,
International Institute Of Information Technology Hyderabad, India
{kesavaraj.v, anuprabha.m}@research.iiit.ac.in
anil.vuppala@iiit.ac.in

Abstract. Identifying user-defined keywords is crucial for personalizing interactions with smart devices. Previous approaches of user-defined keyword spotting (UDKWS) have relied on short-term spectral features such as mel frequency cepstral coefficients (MFCC) to detect the spoken keyword. However, these features may face challenges in accurately identifying closely related pronunciation of audio-text pairs, due to their limited capability in capturing the temporal dynamics of the speech signal. To address this challenge, we propose to use shifted delta coefficients (SDC) which help in capturing pronunciation variability (transition between connecting phonemes) by incorporating long-term temporal information. The performance of the SDC feature is compared with various baseline features across four different datasets using a cross-attention based end-to-end system. Additionally, various configurations of SDC are explored to find the suitable temporal context for the UDKWS task. The experimental results reveal that the SDC feature outperforms the MFCC baseline feature, exhibiting an improvement of 8.32% in area under the curve (AUC) and 8.69% in terms of equal error rate (EER) on the challenging Libriphrase-hard dataset. Moreover, the proposed approach demonstrated superior performance when compared to state-of-the-art UDKWS techniques.

Keywords: shifted delta coefficients, mel spectrogram, cross-attention, user-defined keyword spotting

1 Introduction

Advancements in deep learning technology have transformed voice-activated interactions with machines from science fiction to reality. The proliferation of voice assistants like Amazon’s Alexa, Apple’s Siri, Google’s Assistant, and Microsoft’s Cortana are good proof of this [1]. These voice assistants are activated using a technology called spoken keyword spotting, or simply keyword spotting, which detects specific wake-up words within a continuous audio stream [2]. This helps to avoid activating the more computationally intensive automatic speech recognition (ASR) when unnecessary. For instance, Google’s voice search responds to

the phrase "Okay Google," while Apple's conversational assistant is activated with the phrase "Hey Siri" [3]. However, these keywords are not personalized.

With the growing demand for personalized voice assistants, user-defined keyword spotting (UDKWS) [4, 5], also known as custom keyword detection or open vocabulary keyword spotting, has gained considerable attention. Unlike closed vocabulary keyword spotting [6], where only predetermined keywords are recognized, open vocabulary keyword spotting deals with the challenge of identifying random keywords that the model may not have encountered during training, adding an additional layer of complexity to the task.

Over the years, various techniques have been explored for UDKWS. One of the earliest approaches involves the use of large-vocabulary continuous speech recognition (LVCSR) systems [7, 8]. These systems decode the speech signal, after which the keyword is searched in the generated lattices. Another approach is keyword/filler hidden markov model (HMM) [9, 10]. In this approach, separate HMMs are trained to model keyword and non-keyword audio segments. While these architectures allow for customization of the keyword by modifying the decoding graph, the computational requirements remain significant.

Recent works in UDKWS have focused on developing end-to-end systems that take two inputs: the enrolled keyword references and the speech data to be detected. One such classical approach is the query-by-example (QbyE) [11, 12] approach, which involves matching input queries with pre-enrolled examples. However, the effectiveness of the QbyE method relies heavily on the similarity between the recorded speech during enrollment and the subsequent evaluated speech recordings. Challenges such as diverse vocal characteristics among users and background noise in different environments can significantly impact the consistency of the QbyE method's performance. To address these challenges, researchers have explored text enrollment-based methods [4, 13].

For instance, [14] proposes an ASR-free end-to-end system that generates audio embedding and keyword embedding using an acoustic encoder and a keyword encoder, respectively. These embeddings are then merged into a multilayer perceptron for keyword existence prediction. In [13], an attention-based cross-modal matching approach is proposed to learn the agreement between audio and text keyword at the utterance level. In [15], a novel zero-shot UDKWS is proposed to learn the audio-phoneme relationship of the keyword through phoneme-level detection loss. Also, [16] introduced dynamic sequence partitioning to optimally partition the audio embedding sequence into the same length as the text sequence. These recent end-to-end techniques [15, 16, 13], primarily depend on evaluating speech and text representations in a common latent space, demonstrated promising results in the custom keyword spotting task. Despite these significant advancements in the field of UDKWS, the predominant focus has been on the advancement of deep learning models and training approaches. There has been relatively limited exploration of feature engineering which plays a crucial role in enhancing the performance of any speech application. This observation has motivated us to perform feature-level exploration for UDKWS task.

In literature, mel-scale related features such as MFCC and mel spectrogram are the most commonly used features in UDKWS [13, 16, 15]. While these features provide a good estimation of the local spectra, they may not fully capture the temporal dynamics, such as changes in pronunciation over time, present in spoken keywords. Incorporating contextual information could help the system in capturing this pronunciation variability by modeling frame-level dependencies. Notably, in some studies [17, 18], SDC is well-regarded for their ability to capture long-term temporal information (stacking delta features across several frames) for language identification tasks. Motivated by this fact, we propose to use the SDC feature to enhance the robustness of UDKWS, especially in distinguishing between similar pronunciations of audio-text pairs. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study that explored the importance of long-term temporal information at feature level for UDKWS task. The key contributions of this study include:

- Performance comparison of SDC features with commonly used short-term spectral features, namely MFCC, mel spectrogram, perceptual linear prediction coefficients (PLP), and relative spectral-perceptual linear prediction coefficients (RASTA-PLP) in a common experimental setup.
- Exploration of different configurations of SDC features to determine the appropriate temporal context for the UDKWS task.
- Examination of the system’s performance for keywords of different word lengths.
- Assessment of the efficiency of the proposed approach through comprehensive comparisons with various state-of-the-art UDKWS systems.

The organization of this paper is as follows: Section 2 provides details about the architecture, Section 3 discusses the feature extraction techniques, Section 4 describes the experimental setup, Section 5 presents the results and discussion and Section 6 concludes the study.

2 Architecture

In this section, we will discuss the details of the architecture that is used for studying different audio features for the UDKWS task, as shown in Fig. 1. The proposed architecture is adopted from [19]. It consists of four submodules: audio encoder, text encoder, pattern extractor, and pattern discriminator.

2.1 Audio Encoder

In this study, various short-term and long-term spectral features (discussed in Section 3) are used as input to the audio encoder. The encoder utilized two 2-D convolutional layers (Conv2D), each consisting of 32 filters with a kernel size of 3. To enhance computational efficiency, the initial convolution layer employs a stride of 2 to skip processing of consecutive frames. Additionally, batch normalization is applied after each Conv2D operation to ensure stable training.




Fig. 1: Proposed architecture for user-defined keyword spotting

Following the Conv2D layers, two bidirectional gated recurrent units (Bi-GRU) with a dimension of 64 each are utilized. Finally, a 128-dimensional audio embedding is produced by passing the output from the final Bi-GRU layer to a dense layer. The output from the audio encoder is denoted as $E_a \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times D}$, where m and D denote the length of the audio (i.e. number of frames) and embedding dimension, respectively.

2.2 Text Encoder

It includes a pre-trained Tacotron 2 [20] model, a recurrent sequence-to-sequence text-to-speech (TTS) system, which takes character sequences as input to produce the corresponding audio output. The integration of a pre-trained TTS system in the text encoder is inspired by [19]. The main motivation for including the TTS system is to generate text representations that are aware of audio projections. According to [19], employing intermediate representations from the pre-trained TTS model leads to superior performance compared to using character embeddings as text features. It is also demonstrated that representations from the LSTM block of the Tacotron 2 encoder, with a dimension of 512, effectively act as text features. Consequently, this study adopts a similar approach. The resulting intermediate representations from the TTS model are then passed through a Bi-GRU layer with a dimension of 64. The output from the Bi-GRU layer is subsequently fed into a dense layer with 128 units. The output from the text encoder is denoted as $E_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times D}$, where n and D denote the length of the text (i.e. number of characters) and embedding dimension, respectively.

2.3 Pattern Extractor

Motivated by [21], the pattern extractor employs a cross-attention mechanism to capture temporal correlations between audio and text embeddings. All hidden states from the output of audio and text encoders are fed into the cross-attention

layer to preserve the temporal information. In this setup, the audio embedding E_a functions as both the key and value, while the text embedding E_t acts as the query. The resulting context vector from the pattern extractor contains information regarding the agreement between audio and text.

2.4 Pattern Discriminator

The pattern discriminator determines whether audio and text inputs share the same keyword or not. To achieve this, it consists of a single Bi-GRU layer with a dimension of 128 that takes the context vector from the pattern extractor as input. Subsequently, the output from the last frame of the Bi-GRU layer is passed through a dense layer with a sigmoid as an activation function.

3 Feature Extraction

Representing a speech utterance in a vector of parameters is defined as feature extraction [22]. The significant aim of performing this step is to derive the appropriate/relevant information. In this section, we discuss about five important feature extraction techniques, namely mel spectrograms [13], MFCC [23], PLP [24], RASTA-PLP [25], SDC [17]. These five features are selected after reviewing several works [26, 27, 28, 29, 30] on speech related applications.

3.1 Mel Spectrogram

The mel spectrogram is derived from the magnitude spectrogram, but it's different because the mel filter bank mimics the human ear's perception and emphasizes the lower frequency region more than the higher frequencies. Initially, the magnitude spectrogram—time-frequency representation—is obtained by segmenting the speech waveform into windowed segments and applying the fast fourier transform to each segment. Following this, the computed magnitude spectrogram is mapped to a mel-scale using 40 mel filter banks, and then subjected to a logarithmic operation to generate the mel-spectrogram.

3.2 Mel-Frequency Cepstral Coefficients

MFCC, a popular feature in speech signal processing, captures vocal tract characteristics by representing the short-term power spectrum through a linear cosine transform. This transformation operates on a logarithmic power spectrum, non-linearly scaled to the mel frequency range. The process of calculating MFCC involves windowing the signal, calculating discrete Fourier transform (DFT) coefficients for each window, taking the logarithm of the DFT magnitude, filtering frequencies with the mel scale, and finally extracting the MFCC coefficients. The first 13 cepstral coefficients are considered as MFCC features. The first and second derivatives of 13-dimensional MFCC features have been combined with static MFCCs, referred to as MFCC+ Δ + $\Delta\Delta$, to capture the temporal dynamics present in the speech signal.

3.3 Perceptual Linear Prediction

Several alternatives to MFCC have been proposed for representing short-term speech signals - One such alternative is PLP (perceptual linear prediction coefficients). PLP is a feature that gives representation conforming to a smoothed short-term spectrum that has been equalized and compressed, similar to human hearing, thus making it similar to the MFCC. The process of calculating PLP features starts with windowing the signal, computing discrete Fourier transform (DFT) coefficients for each window, and taking the logarithm of the DFT magnitude to obtain power spectral estimates. Next, a trapezoidal filter is applied at 1-bark intervals to merge overlapping critical band filter responses in the power spectrum, thereby compressing higher frequencies into a narrow band. Finally, the spectral amplitude is compressed by taking the cubic root to match the nonlinear relationship between sound intensity and perceived loudness.

3.4 Relative Spectral - Perceptual Linear Prediction

RASTA-PLP builds upon the PLP technique by introducing a crucial addition: a bandpass filter at each sub-band. By suppressing undesirable frequencies, RASTA-PLP increases the robustness of PLP to noise. The process of RASTA-PLP involves several steps. Initially, it calculates the critical-band power spectrum, followed by the application of a compressing static nonlinear transformation to the spectral amplitude. Subsequently, it filters the time trajectory of each transformed spectral component with a bandpass filter. After this, the filtered speech undergoes further transformation using an expanding static nonlinear transformation. Additionally, it includes equal loudness curve adjustment and the application of the intensity-loudness power law to replicate the human auditory system. In essence, RASTA filtering acts as a modulation-frequency bandpass filter, emphasizing the modulation frequency range most relevant to speech, while disregarding lower or higher modulation frequencies.

3.5 Shifted Delta Coefficients

SDC features, extensively utilized in language identification [18], are pivotal for capturing long-term temporal information. Inspired by this, we propose to use the SDC features for the UDKWS task. The main motivation is to enhance the model's ability to capture the pronunciation variability of the spoken keyword, thus improving the overall performance of UDKWS. In this study, SDC features are computed from Mel-spectrogram, since it gives better performance compared to all other short-term spectral features. The calculation of the SDC feature depends on four parameters, and it is represented as N-d-p-k. Here N represents the number of cepstral coefficients for every frame, d denotes the amount of shift (delay) from the current frame, p denotes the shift between the consecutive delta blocks, and k denotes the number of frames whose deltas are to be concatenated. The delta feature vector for t^{th} frame in the i^{th} iteration is computed as

$$\delta_c(t, i) = c(t + ip + d) - c(t + ip - d), \quad \text{where } 0 \leq i \leq k - 1 \quad (1)$$

These k delta computations are stacked as in (2) to form $k \times N$ dimensional shifted delta coefficients

$$SDC(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \delta_c(t, 0) \\ \delta_c(t, 1) \\ \vdots \\ \delta_c(t, k - 1) \end{pmatrix} \quad (2)$$

The computed stacked delta features are then combined with the static mel spectrogram features to obtain the final SDC feature vector. The effect of variation in parameters (d and k), which control the amount of temporal context, has also been studied.

4 Experimental Setup

4.1 Database

The LibriPhrase dataset [13], derived from the LibriSpeech corpus [31], is utilized for both training and evaluation. It comprises short phrases with varying word lengths, ranging from 1 to 4. The training set of LibriPhrase was generated using the train-clean-100 and train-clean-360 subsets, while the evaluation set was derived from the train-others-500 subset. The evaluation set consists of 4391, 2605, 467, and 56 episodes of each word length respectively. Each episode has three positive and three negative pairs. The negative samples are further categorized into easy and hard based on Levenshtein distance [32], leading to the creation of the LibriPhrase Easy (LP_E) and LibriPhrase Hard (LP_H) datasets. Each example is denoted by 3 entities: (audio, text, target) where the target value is 1 for a positive pair and 0 for a negative pair.

For a comprehensive evaluation of model performance, we expanded our assessment beyond the LibriPhrase dataset by including two additional datasets: the Google Speech Commands V1 dataset (G) [33] and the Qualcomm Keyword Speech dataset (Q) [34]. The Google Speech Commands V1 dataset (G) contains speech recordings from 1,881 speakers, emphasizing 30 small keywords. From that, the validation dataset corresponding to 30 keywords is used for evaluation. On the other hand, the Qualcomm Keyword Speech dataset (Q) includes 4,270 utterances of four keywords spoken by 50 speakers. Each speaker in this dataset contributes approximately 22-23 instances for each keyword.

4.2 Implementation Details

In the feature extraction, all spectral vectors are obtained by block processing the whole speech into short segments using a window length of 25 ms and overlap of 10 ms. A pre-emphasis factor of 0.97 is applied to boost the amount of energy

in the high frequencies. Hamming window is used during the windowing process of speech signal to reduce the spectral leakage. Zero padding is applied along the time dimension to ensure that the input feature representation is of equal size, as required by the input of the Conv2D layer.

The training pipeline is structured as a binary classification task with the objective of classifying the similarity of input pairs {audio, text}. A dropout of 0.2 is applied after each layer in both audio and text encoders to prevent overfitting. The training process utilizes binary cross-entropy loss as the training criterion and employs the Adam optimizer [35] with default parameters for optimization. A batch size of 128 and a fixed learning rate of 10^{-4} are used for training the model and, the best model is selected based on its performance on the validation set. For training, we used four NVIDIA GeForce RTX 2080 Ti GPUs.

5 Results and discussions

The proposed approach provides comprehensive insights about the spoken keyword by leveraging SDC features, known for their proficiency in capturing long-term temporal information. To validate that we conducted extensive experiments across diverse datasets, with results and plots presented in this section.

5.1 Comparison of different front-end features

In this section, the performance comparison between SDC features and various short-term spectral features is discussed to study the importance of long-term temporal information in the UDKWS task. The results are presented in Table 1. Upon analysing the results, it's clear that SDC features consistently outperform all baseline features across all datasets. Furthermore, when compared to the MFCC feature, the SDC feature demonstrates a notable improvement of 8.69% in AUC and 8.32% in EER on the challenging LP_H dataset, which comprises similar pronunciations of audio-text pairs (e.g., "madame" and "modem"). This improvement is attributed to their ability to capture the temporal dynamics of speech signals by incorporating contextual information. On the other hand, PLP, RASTA-PLP, and mel spectrogram exhibit competitive performance with consistently good AUC scores, indicating them as preferable alternatives to SDC. In contrast, MFCC performs poorly compared to all other features. Compared to MFCC alone, MFCC+ Δ + $\Delta\Delta$ which models the temporal dynamics of the speech signal to some extent by concatenating their first and second derivatives to the original MFCC feature, provides significant improvements. Overall, the observations from Table 1 suggest that speech information extracted over a longer context plays a pivotal role in the development of systems for UDKWS tasks.

5.2 SDC configuration

The calculation of SDC features relies on four parameters: N, d, p, and k. Variations in these parameters can significantly affect the amount of temporal context

Table 1: Performance comparison of SDC features with various short-term spectral features across different datasets: Google Commands V1 (G), Qualcomm Keyword Speech dataset (Q), Libriphrase-Easy (LP_E), and Libriphrase-Hard (LP_H)

Features	EER (%)				AUC (%)			
	G	Q	LP _E	LP _H	G	Q	LP _E	LP _H
MFCC	32.24	12.59	7.99	29.8	73.95	91.2	97.8	77.21
MFCC+ Δ + $\Delta\Delta$	30.28	11.8	6.8	27.01	76.5	93.29	98.06	78.54
Mel Spectrogram	27.91	16.7	5.89	26.45	79.13	90.97	98.21	79.81
PLP	28.43	15.37	6.58	25.22	77.65	90.47	97.88	78.81
RASTA-PLP	27.4	14.32	6.42	25.84	78.05	91.24	97.82	79.7
SDC	23.54	9.61	3.84	21.48	83.56	96.73	98.34	85.90

captured. Therefore, an ablation study is conducted by varying d and k values to determine the suitable temporal context for UDKWS, with the results depicted in Fig. 2. Fig. 2 (a) & (b) illustrates the performance change in terms of AUC and EER for varying d values (amount of shift from the current frame) from 1 to 4 while keeping the other parameters fixed. It can be observed that as the d value increases, the performance drops across all datasets, indicating a loss of information when the shift is increased in calculating SDC features. Fig. 2 (c) & (d) show the effect of varying k values (number of frames whose deltas are stacked) ranging from 5 to 10, while keeping the other parameters fixed. It is evident that as the k value increases from 5 to 8, the performance in terms of AUC and EER also increases across all datasets, demonstrating the effect of the context window on UDKWS. However, beyond a k value of 8, performance either saturates or declines, indicating the need for precise contextual information to reliably recognize keywords. Overall, it is evident that the SDC configuration 40-1-3-8 exhibits the best performance with optimal temporal context for UDKWS.

5.3 Analysis on the length of keywords

The evaluation of the system across different word lengths for mel spectrogram (best performing among baseline) and SDC features is studied on the LibriPhrase evaluation dataset. The results in terms of EER, AUC and F1-score are presented in Table 2. When compared to the mel spectrogram, SDC demonstrates absolute improvements of 3.24%, 2.33%, 1.81%, and 2.02% in F1-score for word lengths 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively. Despite the improvements, SDC encounters challenges similar to the mel spectrogram in keyword recognition as word length increases.

Table 2: Performance comparison of SDC and mel spectrogram features across different word lengths

Feature	Word Length	EER (%)	AUC (%)	F 1 score (%)
Mel Spectrogram	1	7.67	97.01	91.11
	2	8.55	96.57	90.98
	3	9.05	95.6	89.76
	4	9.25	95.34	88.30
SDC	1	5.37	98.25	94.34
	2	6.35	97.87	93.31
	3	7.24	96.91	91.57
	4	8.29	96.31	90.32

5.4 Comparison of various UDKWS techniques

In this section, the performance of the proposed approach is compared with various state-of-the-art UDKWS techniques across G, Q, LP_E, LP_H datasets, and the results are presented in Table 3. Evaluation results show that among all the baselines, CMCD (cross-modality correspondence detector) [13] demonstrates strong performance, while Triplet [4] shows weak performance across the Q, LP_E, and LP_H datasets. The attention-based QbyE method demonstrates superior performance on the G dataset due to its similarity scoring mechanism, particularly when the keyword is included in the training set. However, it shows degraded performance when the keyword is unfamiliar as observed in Q and LibriPhrase. In contrast, our proposed approach outperforms all the baselines on all datasets except G. Specifically, compared to the CMCD baseline, our proposed method demonstrates a substantial improvement in EER of 4.58% in the LP_E dataset and 11.42% in the LP_H dataset. Additionally, the model is evaluated on datasets G and Q without any fine-tuning to assess its generalization capability. We observe a consistent improvement of approximately 2% on the AUC

Table 3: Performance comparison of the proposed method with various UDKWS techniques across different datasets: Google Commands V1 (G), Qualcomm Keyword Speech dataset (Q), LibriPhrase-Easy (LP_E), and LibriPhrase-Hard (LP_H).

Method	EER (%)				AUC (%)			
	G	Q	LP _E	LP _H	G	Q	LP _E	LP _H
CTC [12]	31.65	18.23	14.67	35.22	66.36	89.69	92.29	69.58
Attention [11]	14.75	49.13	28.74	41.95	92.09	50.13	78.74	62.65
Triplet [4]	35.6	38.72	32.75	44.36	71.48	66.44	63.53	54.88
CMCD [13]	27.25	12.15	8.42	32.9	81.06	94.51	96.7	73.58
Proposed	23.54	9.61	3.84	21.48	83.56	96.73	98.34	85.9

metric and 3% on the EER metric across datasets G and Q compared to the CMCD baseline. This demonstrates the effectiveness of the proposed approach in recognizing user-defined keywords that are not seen during training.




Fig. 2: Performance Analysis of SDC Configuration across four datasets. (a) & (b) illustrate the effect of varying d values. (c) & (d) illustrate the effect of varying k values.

6 Conclusion

This study presented the importance of long-term temporal information for the UDKWS task. The evaluation results indicated that SDC features outperformed the widely used short-term spectral features. Notably, it showcased its potential in distinguishing similar pronunciations of audio-text pairs in the Libriphrase hard dataset. Furthermore, the ablation study on different SDC configurations revealed that configuration 40-1-3-8 exhibited the best performance with a suitable temporal context. Moreover, the proposed approach demonstrated superior performance compared to state-of-the-art UDKWS approaches. In future work, the focus will be on improving the performance of the UDKWS system by ex-

ploring the potential of hybrid feature extraction approaches rather than relying on individual counterparts.

References

- [1] Matthew B Hoy. “Alexa, Siri, Cortana, and more: an introduction to voice assistants”. In: *Medical reference services quarterly* 37.1 (2018), pp. 81–88.
- [2] Iván López-Espejo et al. “Deep spoken keyword spotting: An overview”. In: *IEEE Access* 10 (2021), pp. 4169–4199.
- [3] Oriol Vinyals and Steven Wegmann. “Chasing the metric: Smoothing learning algorithms for keyword detection”. In: *Proc. ICASSP*. IEEE. 2014, pp. 3301–3305.
- [4] Niccolò Sacchi et al. “Open-Vocabulary Keyword Spotting with Audio and Text Embeddings”. In: *Proc. Interspeech*. 2019, pp. 3362–3366.
- [5] Krishna Gurugubelli, Sahil Mohamed, and Rajesh Krishna KS. “Comparative Study of Tokenization Algorithms for End-to-End Open Vocabulary Keyword Detection”. In: *Proc. ICASSP*. IEEE. 2024, pp. 12431–12435.
- [6] Tara N. Sainath and Carolina Parada. “Convolutional neural networks for small-footprint keyword spotting”. In: *Proc. Interspeech*. 2015, pp. 1478–1482.
- [7] David RH Miller et al. “Rapid and accurate spoken term detection”. In: *Proc. Interspeech*. 2007.
- [8] Guoguo Chen et al. “Using proxies for OOV keywords in the keyword search task”. In: *Proc. Automatic Speech Recognition and Understanding (ASRU)*. IEEE. 2013, pp. 416–421.
- [9] Richard C Rose and Douglas B Paul. “A hidden Markov model based keyword recognition system”. In: *Proc. ICASSP*. IEEE. 1990, pp. 129–132.
- [10] Jan Robin Rohlicek et al. “Continuous hidden Markov modeling for speaker-independent word spotting”. In: *Proc. ICASSP*. IEEE. 1989, pp. 627–630.
- [11] Jinmiao Huang et al. “Query-by-example keyword spotting system using multi-head attention and soft-triple loss”. In: *Proc. ICASSP*. IEEE. 2021, pp. 6858–6862.
- [12] L. Lugosch, S. Myer, and V. S. Tomar. “DONUT: CTC-based Query-by-Example Keyword Spotting”. In: *NeurIPS Workshop on Interpretability and Robustness in Audio, Speech, and Language*. Montreal, Canada, Dec. 2018.
- [13] Hyeon-Kyeong Shin et al. “Learning Audio-Text Agreement for Open-vocabulary Keyword Spotting”. In: *Proc. INTERSPEECH*. 2022, pp. 1871–1875.
- [14] Kartik Audhkhasi et al. “End-to-end ASR-free keyword search from speech”. In: *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing* 11.8 (2017), pp. 1351–1359.
- [15] Yong-Hyeok Lee and Namhyun Cho. “PhonMatchNet: Phoneme-Guided Zero-Shot Keyword Spotting for User-Defined Keywords”. In: *Proc. INTERSPEECH*. 2023, pp. 3964–3968.

- [16] Kumari Nishu, Minsik Cho, and Devang Naik. “Matching Latent Encoding for Audio-Text based Keyword Spotting”. In: *Proc. INTERSPEECH*. 2023, pp. 1613–1617.
- [17] Ravi Kumar Vuddagiri, Hari Krishna Vydana, and Anil Kumar Vuppala. “Improved Language Identification Using Stacked SDC Features and Residual Neural Network”. In: *Proc. 6th Workshop on Spoken Language Technologies for Under-Resourced Languages*. 2018, pp. 210–214.
- [18] Pedro A Torres-Carrasquillo et al. “Approaches to language identification using Gaussian mixture models and shifted delta cepstral features.” In: *Proc. Interspeech*. 2002, pp. 89–92.
- [19] Kesavaraaj V and Anil Kumar Vuppala. *Open vocabulary keyword spotting through transfer learning from speech synthesis*. 2024. arXiv: 2404.03914.
- [20] Jonathan Shen et al. “Natural tts synthesis by conditioning wavenet on mel spectrogram predictions”. In: *Proc. ICASSP*. IEEE. 2018, pp. 4779–4783.
- [21] Ashish Vaswani et al. “Attention is all you need”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [22] Deepti Deshwal, Pardeep Sangwan, and Divya Kumar. “A language identification system using hybrid features and back-propagation neural network”. In: *Applied Acoustics* 164 (2020), p. 107289.
- [23] Zrar Kh Abdul and Abdulbasit K Al-Talabani. “Mel frequency cepstral coefficient and its applications: A review”. In: *IEEE Access* 10 (2022), pp. 122136–122158.
- [24] Hynek Hermansky. “Perceptual linear predictive (PLP) analysis of speech”. In: *the Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 87.4 (1990), pp. 1738–1752.
- [25] H Hermansky et al. “RASTA-PLP speech analysis technique”. In: *[Proceedings] ICASSP-92: 1992 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*. Vol. 1. IEEE. 1992, pp. 121–124.
- [26] Amit Meghanani, CS Anoop, and AG Ramakrishnan. “An exploration of log-mel spectrogram and MFCC features for Alzheimer’s dementia recognition from spontaneous speech”. In: *IEEE spoken language technology workshop (SLT)*. IEEE. 2021, pp. 670–677.
- [27] HK Palo, Mihir Narayana Mohanty, and Mahesh Chandra. “Use of different features for emotion recognition using MLP network”. In: *Computational Vision and Robotics: Proceedings of ICCVR*. Springer. 2015, pp. 7–15.
- [28] Ben Milner. “A comparison of front-end configurations for robust speech recognition”. In: *Proc. ICASSP*. IEEE. 2002, pp. I–797.
- [29] Savitha S Upadhya, AN Cheeran, and Jagannath H Nirmal. “Thomson Multitaper MFCC and PLP voice features for early detection of Parkinson disease”. In: *Biomedical Signal Processing and Control* 46 (2018), pp. 293–301.
- [30] Md. Sahidullah, Tomi Kinnunen, and Cemal Hanilçi. “A comparison of features for synthetic speech detection”. In: *Proc. Interspeech*. 2015, pp. 2087–2091.

- [31] Vassil Panayotov et al. “Librispeech: an asr corpus based on public domain audio books”. In: *Proc. ICASSP*. IEEE. 2015, pp. 5206–5210.
- [32] Vladimir I Levenshtein et al. “Binary codes capable of correcting deletions, insertions, and reversals”. In: *Soviet physics doklady*. Vol. 10. 8. Soviet Union. 1966, pp. 707–710.
- [33] Pete Warden. “Speech commands: A dataset for limited-vocabulary speech recognition”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.03209* (2018).
- [34] Byeonggeun Kim et al. “Query-by-example on-device keyword spotting”. In: *Proc. ASRU*. IEEE. 2019, pp. 532–538.
- [35] Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. “Adam: A method for stochastic optimization”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980* (2014).