

A survey of deep learning audio generation methods

Matej Božić*, Marko Horvat†

Department of Applied Computing

University of Zagreb, Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Computing, Zagreb, Croatia

*matej.bozic@fer.hr †marko.horvat3@fer.hr

Abstract—This article presents a review of typical techniques used in three distinct aspects of deep learning model development for audio generation. In the first part of the article, we provide an explanation of audio representations, beginning with the fundamental audio waveform. We then progress to the frequency domain, with an emphasis on the attributes of human hearing, and finally introduce a relatively recent development. The main part of the article focuses on explaining basic and extended deep learning architecture variants, along with their practical applications in the field of audio generation. The following architectures are addressed: 1) Autoencoders 2) Generative adversarial networks 3) Normalizing flows 4) Transformer networks 5) Diffusion models. Lastly, we will examine four distinct evaluation metrics that are commonly employed in audio generation. This article aims to offer novice readers and beginners in the field a comprehensive understanding of the current state of the art in audio generation methods as well as relevant studies that can be explored for future research.

Index Terms—Deep learning, Audio representations, Audio generation, Generative models, Sound synthesis

I. INTRODUCTION

THE trend towards deep learning in Computer Vision (CV) and Natural Language Processing (NLP) has also reached the field of audio generation [1]. Deep learning has allowed us to move away from the complexity of hand-crafted features towards simple representations by letting the depth of the model create more complex mappings. We define audio generation as any method whose outputs are audio and cannot be derived solely from the inputs. Even though tasks such as text-to-speech involve translation from the text domain to the speech domain, there are many unknowns, such as the speaker’s voice. This means that the models have to invent or generate information for the translation to work. There are many applications for audio generation. We can create human-sounding voice assistants, generate ambient sounds for games or movies based on the current visual input, create various music samples to help music producers with ideas or composition, and much more. The structure of the presented survey on deep learning audio generation methods is illustrated in Figure 1.

This article will mainly focus on deep learning methods, as the field seems to be developing in this direction. Nevertheless, section III will examine the development of audio generation methods over the years, starting around the 1970s. We consider this section important because, just as deep learning methods have re-emerged, there may be a time when audio generation methods that are now obsolete become state-of-the-art again. The goal is to take a broad but shallow look at the field of




Figure 1. The main sections of the survey.

audio generation. Some areas, such as text-to-speech, will be more heavily represented as they have received more attention, but an attempt has been made to include many different subfields. This article does not attempt to present all possible methods but only introduces the reader to some of the popular methods in the field. Each listing of works on a topic is sorted so that the most recent articles are at the end.

The article is structured as follows: section II presents previous work dealing with deep learning in audio, section III gives a brief overview of previous audio generation methods in text-to-speech and music generation, section IV deals with the two most prominent features and a recent advancement, section V discusses five deep learning architectures and some of their popular extensions, and finally, section VI looks at measuring the performance of generation models, some of which are specific to audio generation, while others are more generally applicable.

II. RELATED WORK

In this section, we will mention some of the works that are good sources for further research in the field of audio generation. Some of them investigate only a specific model architecture or sub-area, while others, like this work, show a broader view.

In Zhao, Xia, and Togneri [2], deep learning discriminative and generative architectures are discussed, along with their applications in speech and music synthesis. The article covers discriminative neural networks such as Multi-Layer Perceptron

(MLP), Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN), and Recurrent Neural Networks (RNN), as well as generative neural networks like Variational Autoencoders (VAE) and Deep Belief Networks (DBN). They also describe generative adversarial networks (GAN), their flaws, and enhancement strategies (with Wasserstein GAN as a standout). The study mainly focuses on speech generation and doesn't focus much on different hybrid models.

In contrast, Purwins et al. [3] emphasizes other areas of modeling, including feature representations, loss functions, data, and evaluation methods. It also investigates a variety of additional application fields, including enhancement as well as those outside of audio generation, such as source separation, audio classification, and tagging. They describe various audio aspects that are not covered here, such as the mel frequency cepstral coefficients (MFCC) and the constant-Q spectrogram. They do not cover as many architectures, but they do provide domain-specific datasets and evaluation methods.

Unlike previous works, Briot, Hadjeres, and Pachet [4] attempts to comprehensively examine a specific field of audio generation. This study considers five dimensions of music generation: objective, representation, architecture, challenge, and strategy. It looks at a variety of representations, both domain-specific and more general. Explains the fundamentals of music theory, including notes, rhythm, and chords. Introduces various previously established architectures such as MLP, VAE, RNN, CNN, and GAN, as well as some new ones like the Restricted Boltzmann Machine (RBM). Finally, it discusses the many challenges of music generation and ways for overcoming them. The work is quite extensive; however, some sections may benefit from a more detailed explanation.

Huzaifah and Wyse [5] is another work that explores the subject of music generation and includes music translation. It discusses data representation, generative neural networks, and two popular DNN-based synthesizers. It discusses the issue of long-term dependence and how conditioning might alleviate it. Explains the autoregressive (AR) and normalized flow (NF) models, as well as VAE and GAN.

Peeters and Richard [1] provides an overview of deep learning techniques for audio. It distinguishes architectures from meta-architectures. The architectures include MLP, CNN, Temporal Convolutional Networks (TCN), and RNN, while the meta-architectures are Auto-Encoders (AE), VAE, GAN, Encoder/Decoder, Attention Mechanism, and Transformers. Divides audio representations into three categories: time-frequency, waveform, and knowledge-driven. Time-frequency representations include the Short-Time Fourier Transform (STFT), MFCC, Log-Mel-Spectrogram (LMS), and Constant-Q-Transform (CQT). The article concludes with a list of applications for audio deep learning algorithms, including music content description, environmental sound description, and content processing. It also briefly discusses semi-supervised and self-supervised learning.

Tan et al. [6] provides a comprehensive overview of TTS methods, including history. It explains the basic components of TTS systems, such as text analysis, acoustic models, and vocoders, and includes a list of models in each area. Finally, it discusses advanced methods for implementing TTS systems in

certain use situations, such as Fast TTS, Low-Resource TTS, and Robust TTS.

Shi [7] discusses TTS, music generation, audiovisual multi-modal processing, and datasets. This effort differs from earlier ones in that it organizes relevant articles by category rather than explaining subjects in depth.

Natsiou and O'Leary [8] is the closest work to this one. It follows a similar structure, starting with input representations including raw waveforms, spectrograms, acoustic characteristics, embeddings, and symbolic representations, followed by conditioning representations used to guide audio synthesis. Includes audio synthesis techniques such as AR, NF, GAN, and VAE. The article concludes with the following evaluation methods: perceptual evaluation, number of statistically different bins, inception score, distance-based measurements, spectral convergence, and log likelihood.

Latif et al. [9] provides an overview of transformer architectures used in the field of speech processing. The article provides a description of the transformer, a list of popular transformers for speech, and a literature review on its applications.

Zhang et al. [10] surveys TTS and speech enhancement, with a focus on diffusion models. Although the emphasis is on diffusion models, they also discuss the stages of TTS, pioneering work, and specialized models for distinct speech enhancement tasks.

Mehrish et al. [11] conducted a comprehensive survey of deep learning techniques in speech processing. It begins with speech features and traditional speech processing models. It addresses the following deep learning architectures: RNN, CNN, Transformer, Conformer, Sequence-to-Sequence models (Seq2seq), Reinforcement learning, Graph neural networks (GNN), and diffusion probabilistic networks. Explains supervised, unsupervised, semi-supervised, and self-directed speech representation learning. Finally, it discusses a variety of speech processing tasks, including neural speech synthesis, speech-to-speech translation, speech enhancement, audio super resolution, as well transfer learning techniques.

III. BACKGROUND

The main purpose of this section is to show how audio generation has developed over the years up to this point. Since audio generation is a broad field that encompasses many different areas, such as text-to-speech synthesis, voice conversion, speech enhancement,... [12], we will only focus on two different areas of audio generation: text-to-speech synthesis and music generation. There is no particular reason for this choice, except that they are among the more popular ones. The trend we want to show is how domain-specific knowledge is shifting towards general-purpose methods and how feature engineering is turning into feature recognition.

A. Text-to-Speech

Text-to-speech (TTS) is a task with numerous applications, ranging from phone assistants to GPS navigators. The desire to construct a machine that can communicate with a human has historically fueled growth in this subject. Conventional speech

synthesis technologies include rule-based concatenative speech synthesis (CSS) and statistical parametric speech synthesis (SPSS) [13]. CSS and SPSS, which employ speech data, may be considered corpus-based speech synthesis approaches [14].

Until the late 1980s, the field was dominated by rule-based systems [15]. They were heavily reliant on domain expertise such as phonological theory, necessitating the collaboration of many experts to develop a comprehensive rule set that would generate speech parameters. There are numerous works like Liberman et al. [16], Holmes, Mattingly, and Shearme [17], Coker, Umeda, and Browman [18], and Klatt [19].

CSS methods try to achieve the naturalness and intelligibility of speech by combining chunks of recorded speech. They can be divided into two categories: fixed inventory and unit-selection approaches [13]. Fixed inventory uses only one instance of each concatenative unit, which goes through signal processing before being combined into a spoken word. An example of this might be Dixon and Maxey [20], which uses the diphone method of segment assembly. On the other hand, unit-selection employs a large number of concatenative units, which can result in a better match between adjacent units, potentially boosting speech quality. There are two fundamental concepts: target cost and concatenation cost. The target cost determines how well an element from a database of units fits the desired unit, whereas the concatenation cost indicates how well a pair of selected units combine. The goal is to minimize both costs for the entire sequence of units; this is commonly done using a Viterbi search [13]. Although it is always possible to minimize costs, the resulting speech may still contain errors. This can arise owing to a lack of units to choose from, an issue that can be mitigated by increasing the database size. It sounds straightforward; however, doing so increases unit creation costs and search times due to the increased number of possible concatenations. All of this requires CSS techniques to pick between speech quality and synthesis speed. Works in this domain include Sagisaka [21], where they employ non-uniform synthesis units, and Hunt and Black [22], which treats units of a unit-selection database as states in a state transition network.

SPSS models speech parameters using statistical methods depending on the desired phoneme sequence. This differs from CSS techniques in that we are not maintaining natural, unaltered speech but rather teaching the model how to recreate it. In a typical SPSS system, this is done by first extracting parametric representations of speech and then modeling them using generative models, commonly by applying the maximum likelihood criterion [23]. The primary advantage of SPSS over CSS is its ability to generalize to unknown data [13]. This enables us to adjust the model to generate different voice characteristics [15]. It also requires orders of magnitude less memory because we use model parameters instead of a speech database. Although there are other SPSS techniques, the majority of research has centered on hidden Markov models (HMM) [15].

Some HMM works include Toda and Tokuda [14], which considers not only the output probability of static and dynamic feature vectors but also the global variance (GV). Nakamura et al. [24] directly models speech waveforms with a trajectory

HMM. Yoshimura et al. [25] and Tokuda, Zen, and Black [26] use decision-tree-based context clustering to represent spectrum, pitch, and HMM state duration simultaneously. Commonly used contexts include the current phoneme, preceding and succeeding phonemes, the position of the current syllable within the current word or phrase, etc. [27].

The notion that the human speech system has a layered structure in its transformation of the linguistic level to the waveform level has stimulated the adoption of deep neural network speech synthesis [28]. Burniston and Curtis [29] employs an artificial neural network alongside a rule-based method to model speech parameters. Ling, Deng, and Yu [30] employs limited Boltzmann machines and deep belief networks to predict speech parameters for each HMM state. Some other methods worth noting are multi-layer perceptron [28, 31–34], time-delay neural network [35, 36], long short-term memory [37–40], gated recurrent unit [41], attention-based recurrent network [42], and mixture density network [41, 43].

The TTS system consists of four major components: the first converts text to a linguistic representation, the second determines the duration of each speech segment, the third converts the linguistic and timing representations into speech parameters, and the fourth is the vocoder, which generates the speech waveform based on the speech parameters [35]. The majority of the works we presented focused on converting the linguistic representation into speech parameters, but there are also models focusing on, for example, grapheme-to-phoneme conversion [44, 45] to allow TTS without knowledge of linguistic features. Examples of vocoders include MLSA [46], STRAIGHT [47], and Vocaine [48]. Finally, there have also been attempts to construct a fully end-to-end system, which means integrating text analysis and acoustic modeling into a single model [42].

B. Music generation

Music has been a part of human life long before the invention of the electronic computer, and people have developed many guidelines for how beautifully sounded music should be made. For this reason alone, the discipline of music generation has placed a heavy emphasis on rule-based systems that use music theory to create logical rules. Unlike text, musical vocabulary is rather tiny, consisting of at most several hundred discrete note symbols [49]. Music creation is classified into six categories: grammars, knowledge-based, markov chains, artificial neural networks, evolutionary methods, and self-similarity [50]. Specific methods include discrete nonlinear maps [51, 52], rule-based [53, 54], genetic algorithm [55–58], recurrent neural network [57, 59], long short-term memory [60–63], markov chain [52, 64], context-free grammars [58, 64], context-sensitive grammars [65, 66], cellular automaton [67], random fields [49], L-systems [68], knowledge base [69], and restricted Boltzmann machines [70]. Unlike language, music employs a significantly smaller number of acoustic features. These include MIDI representation [56, 62], encoded sheet music [57], binary vector of an octave [49], and piano roll [62, 70].

IV. AUDIO FEATURES

Even though there have been numerous audio features used throughout the history of audio generation. Here we will describe the two most popular features, the raw waveform and the log-mel spectrogram, but also mention features that have recently gained traction. Keep in mind that there are too many features to describe them all, especially if we take into account the many hand-crafted features that were created before the rise of deep learning methods.

A. Raw waveform

The term "raw audio" typically refers to a waveform recorded using pulse code modulation (PCM) [8]. In PCM, a continuous waveform is sampled at uniform intervals, known as the sampling frequency. According to the sampling principle, if a signal is sampled at regular intervals at a rate slightly higher than twice the highest signal frequency, then it will contain all of the original signal information [71]. The average sample frequency for audio applications is 44.1 kHz [8], hence we cannot hold frequencies equal to or greater than 22.05 kHz. Computers cannot store real numbers with absolute precision; thus, each sample value is approximated by assigning it an element from a set of finite values, a technique known as quantization [8]. The most common quantization levels are kept in 8 bits (256 levels), 16 bits (65536 levels), and 24 bits (16.8 million levels) [8].

The advantage of using raw audio waveforms is that they can be easily transformed into actual sound. In certain tasks, the disadvantages appear to outweigh the benefits, as raw waveforms are still not universally used. The issue is that raw audio synthesis at higher bit rates becomes problematic due to the sheer amount of states involved [72]. For example, 24-bit audio signals have more than 16 million states. High sampling rates create exceptionally long sequences, making raw audio synthesis more challenging [73]. μ -law is frequently employed in speech generative models like WaveNet [74] to compress integer values and sequence length. The method can quantize each timestep to 256 values and reconstruct high-quality audio [73]. According to Dieleman, van den Oord, and Simonyan [75], increased bit depth representation can lead to models learning undesirable aspects, such as the calm background of the surroundings. It should be emphasized that this issue was only observed in older publications and is not discussed in current ones.

The most common models that use raw waveforms as their representation of choice are text-to-speech models called vocoders. In section III, we mentioned vocoders, which are used to translate mid-term representations, such as mel-spectrograms, to raw audio waveforms. Examples include WaveNet [74], SampleRNN [76], and Deep Voice 3 [77].

B. Mel-spectrogram

Before we can talk about mel-spectrograms, we must first understand the Short-Time Fourier Transform (STFT). To represent audio frequencies, we use a Discrete-Fourier Transform (DFT), which transforms the original waveform into a sum of

weighted complex exponentials [78]. The problem emerges when we attempt to analyze complex audio signals; because the content of most audio signals changes over time, we can't use DFT to figure out how frequencies change. Instead, we use STFT to apply DFT to overlapping sections of the audio waveform [8]. Most techniques that use the STFT to represent audio consider just its amplitude [1], which results in a lossy representation. By removing the phase of the STFT, we can arrange it in a time/frequency visual, creating a spectrogram.

A mel-spectrogram compresses the STFT in the frequency axis by projecting it onto a scale known as the mel-scale [79]. The mel-scale divides the frequency range into a set of mel-frequency bands, with higher frequencies having lower resolution and lower frequencies having higher resolution [11]. The scale was inspired by the non-linear frequency perception of human hearing [11]. Applying the logarithm to the amplitude results in the log-mel-spectrogram [1]. Finally, using the discrete cosine transform yields the mel frequency cepstral coefficients (MFCC) [3]. MFCC is a popular representation in speech applications [13], but it was shown to be unnecessary with deep learning models [1, 3].

While representations such as the STFT and raw waveform are invertible, the spectrogram is not, so we must use some approach to approximate the missing values. The algorithms used for these were already mentioned in the previous section. In addition to neural-based vocoders, other algorithms include Griffin-Lim [80], gradient-based inversion [81], single-pass spectrogram inversion (SPSI) [82], and phase gradient heap integration (PGHI) [83]. Mel-spectrograms have been frequently utilized as intermediate features in text-to-speech pipelines [7]. Tacotron 1/2 [84, 85] and FastSpeech 1/2 [86, 87] are examples of such models. To better illustrate the compression of the mel-spectrogram, take, for example, a 5-minute video sampled at 44.1 kHz. With 16-bit depth, our raw waveform will take up ≈ 25 MB, while the mel-spectrogram with a common configuration¹ of 80 bins, 256 hop size, 1024 window size, and 1024 points of Fourier transform takes up ≈ 8 MB at the same bit depth. In a 2018 article, it was proven that mel-spectrogram is preferable over STFT because it achieves the same performance while having a more compact representation [88]. Given the field's progress, it should be emphasized that only recurrent and convolutional models were examined in the article. Another advantage of the mel-spectrogram, and spectrograms in general, is that they can be displayed as images. Because it ignores phase information, it can be shown with one dimension being frequency and the other being time. This is useful since images have been widely employed in computer vision tasks, allowing us to borrow models for usage in the audio domain. There is a concern as spectrograms aren't the same as images due to the different meaning of the axis. This does not appear to have a substantial effect since many works implement mel-spectrograms in their convolutional models [1].

¹Based on a small sample of articles observed using mel-spectrograms

C. Neural codecs

An audio codec is a signal processing technique that compresses an audio signal into discrete codes before using those codes to reconstruct the audio signal, which is not always possible with complete accuracy. A typical audio codec system consists of three components: an encoder, a quantizer, and a decoder. The function of each component is explained in section V-A. The goal of an audio codec is to use as little information as possible to store or transmit an audio signal while ensuring that the decoded audio quality is not significantly reduced by eliminating redundant or irrelevant information from the audio signal. Traditionally, this is accomplished by changing the signal and trading off the quality of specific signal components that are less likely to influence the quality [89]. Audio codecs have been utilized for a wide range of applications, including mobile and internet communication. There are numerous types of audio codecs; some are utilized in real-time applications like streaming, while others may be used for audio production. Whereas in streaming, latency is a larger concern, which means sacrificing quality for speed, in production, we want to retain as much detail as possible while maintaining a compact representation.

Audio codecs can be separated into two categories: waveform codecs and parametric codecs. Waveform codecs make little to no assumptions about the nature of audio, allowing them to work with any audio signal. This universality makes them well-suited for creating high-quality audio at low compression, but they tend to produce artifacts when operating at high compression [90]. Furthermore, because they do not operate well in high compression, they tend to increase storage and transmission costs. In contrast to waveform codecs, parametric codecs make assumptions about the source audio being encoded and introduce strong priors in the form of a parametric model that characterizes the audio synthesis process. The goal is not to achieve a faithful reconstruction on a sample-by-sample basis but rather to generate audio that is perceptually comparable to the original [90]. Parametric codecs offer great compression but suffer from low decoded audio quality and noise susceptibility [91].

On the way to the neural codec, we first encountered hybrid codecs, which substituted some parametric codec modules with neural networks. This type of codec improves performance by leveraging neural networks' adaptability. Following that came vocoder-based approaches, which could leverage previously introduced neural vocoders to reconstruct audio signals by conditioning them on parametric coder codes or quantized acoustic features. However, their performance and compression were still dependent on the handcrafted features received at the input [92]. The observation that separating models into modules prevents them from functioning effectively has inspired end-to-end auto-encoders (E2E AE) that accept raw waveforms as input and output. A standard E2E AE is made up of four basic components: an encoder, a projector, a quantizer, and a decoder [92]. The basic use case is to take the raw waveform and use the encoder to construct a representation with reduced temporal resolution, which is then projected into a multidimensional space by the

projector component. To make the representations suitable for transmission and storage, we further quantize the projections into codes. These codes make up a lookup table, which is used at the other end by the decoder to transform the quantized representations back to a raw waveform. Shen et al. [93] defines the neural codec as a kind of neural network model that converts audio waveform into compact representations with a codec encoder and reconstructs audio waveform from these representations with a codec decoder. The core idea is to use the audio codec to compress the speech or sound into a set of discrete tokens, and then the generation model is used to generate these tokens [94]. They have been shown to allow for cross-modal tasks [95].

Neural codec methods include SoundStream [90], EnCodec [89], HiFi-Codec [94], AudioDec [92], and APCodec [91]. All the said methods use residual vector quantization (RVQ), while HiFi-Codec also introduced an extension called group-RVQ. VQ methods will be talked about in section V-A. SoundStream [90] is used by AudioLM, [96], MusicLM [97], SingSong [98] and SoundStorm [99], while EnCodec [89] is used by VALL-E [73], VALL-E X [100], Speech-X [101], and ViOLA [95].

Finally, despite the fact that neural codec approaches are relatively new, they have not been without criticism. Shen et al. [93] noted that although RVQ can achieve acceptable reconstruction quality and low bitrate, they are meant for compression and transmission; therefore, they may not be suited as intermediate representations for audio production jobs. This is because the sequence of discrete tokens created by RVQ can be very long, approximately N times longer when N residual quantifiers are utilized. Because language models cannot handle extremely long sequences, we will encounter inaccurate predictions of discrete tokens, resulting in word skipping, word repetition, or speech collapse issues while attempting to reconstruct the speech waveform from these tokens.

V. ARCHITECTURES

As the models become more advanced, they start utilizing many different architectures in unison, making it impossible to categorize them efficiently. Therefore, each subsection will contain models that fit into many subsections but have been divided up in the way the author thought made the most sense. Unlike the audio features, there are many different architectures. Here we will mention the architectures that have been most commonly used in the field of audio generation.

A. Auto-encoders

The majority of this section was taken from works by Goodfellow, Bengio, and Courville [102] and Kingma and Welling [103].

The auto-encoder's objective is to duplicate the input into the output. It consists of two parts: an encoder and a decoder. The intersection of the two components depicts a code that attempts to represent both the input and, by extension, the output. The encoder receives input data and changes it into a code that the decoder then uses to approximate the original

input. If we allowed arbitrary values in the encoder and decoder, we would obtain no meaningful code because it would simply simulate an identity function. To obtain meaningful code, we constrain both the encoder and decoder, preventing them from just passing data through. We can accomplish this by, for example, restricting the dimensionality of the values in the model. The auto-encoder has the advantage of not requiring labeled data because it merely seeks to reconstruct the input, allowing for unsupervised learning. Lee et al. [104] demonstrates a basic use case for a simple auto-encoder, feature extraction. While VITS [105] connects two text-to-speech modules using VAE, enabling end-to-end learning in an adversarial setting. Figure 2a depicts a simple auto-encoder setup using generic encoder and decoder components.

As this article focuses on generation, we will now introduce one of the most popular forms of the auto-encoder, the Variational Auto-Encoder (VAE) [1]. VAE has been proposed to enable us to employ auto-encoders as generative models [8]. The VAE components can be considered as a combination of two separately parameterized models, the recognition model and the generative model. The VAE’s success was mostly due to the choice of the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence as the loss function [8]. KL will also be described in section VI. Unlike the auto-encoder, the VAE learns the parameters of a probability distribution rather than a compressed representation of the data [5]. Modeling the probability distribution allows us to sample from the learned data distribution. The Gaussian distribution is typically used for its generality [4]. MusicVAE [106] uses a hierarchical decoder in a recurrent VAE to avoid posterior collapse. BUTTER [107] creates a unified multi-model representation learning model using VAEs. Music FaderNets [108] introduces a Gaussian Mixture VAE. RAVE [109] employs multi-stage training, initially with representation learning and then with adversarial fine-tuning. Tango [110] and Make-An-Audio 2 [111] generate mel-spectrograms by using VAE in a diffusion model.

Vector-Quantized VAE (VQ-VAE) is an extension of VAE that places the latent representation in a discrete latent space. VQ-VAE changes the auto-encoder structure by introducing a new component called the codebook. The most significant change happens between the encoder and decoder, where the encoder’s output is used in a nearest neighbor lookup utilizing the codebook. In other words, the continuous value received from the encoder is quantized and mapped onto a discrete latent space that will be received by the decoder. VQ-VAE replaces the KL divergence loss with negative log likelihood, codebook, and commitment losses. One possible issue with the VQ-VAE is codebook collapse. This occurs when the model stops using a piece of the codebook, indicating that it is no longer at full capacity. It can result in decreased likelihoods and inadequate reconstruction [75]. Dieleman, van den Oord, and Simonyan [75] proposes the argmax auto-encoder as an alternative to VQ-VAE for music generation. MelGAN [112], VQVAE [113], Jukebox [114] with Hierarchical VQ-VAE, DiscreTalk [115], FIGARO [116], Diffsound [117], and Im2Wav [118] use VQ-VAE to compress the input to a lower-dimensional space. While Dance2Music-GAN [119], SpeechT5 [120], VQTTS [121], and DelightfulTTS 2 [122]

only use the vector quantization.

Residual Vector Quantization (RVQ) improves VAE by computing the residual after quantization and further quantizing it using a second codebook, a third, and so on [89]. In other words, RVQ cascades N layers of VQ where unquantized input vector is passed through a first VQ and quantization residuals are computed, then those residuals are iteratively quantized by an additional sequence of $N-1$ vector quantizers [90]. Section IV-C provides a list of models that employ RVQ.

B. Generative adversarial networks

Another prominent generating architecture is generative adversarial networks (GAN). It is made up of two models that serve different purposes: the generator and the discriminator. The generator’s function is to convert a random input vector to a data sample. The random vector is usually smaller because the generator mimics the decoder part of the auto-encoder [1]. Unlike VAE, which imposes a distribution to generate realistic data, GAN utilizes a second network called the discriminator [1]. It takes the generator’s output or a sample from the dataset and attempts to classify it as either real or fake. The generator is penalized based on the discriminator’s ability to tell the difference between real and fake. The opposite is also true: if the discriminator is unable to distinguish between the generator and the actual data points, it is penalized as well. In other words, the two neural networks face off in a two-player minimax game. According to [123], the ideal outcome for network training is for the discriminator to be 50% certain whether the input is real or bogus. In practice, we train the generator through the discriminator by reducing the probability that the sample is fake, while the discriminator does the opposite for fake data and the same for real data. Figure 2b illustrates the generator taking a random vector input and the discriminator attempting to distinguish between real and fake samples.

This basic setup allows us to generate samples resembling those in the dataset, but it doesn’t let us condition the generation. In other words, the random vector used in the generator does not match the semantic features of the data [5]. Many datasets contain additional information about each sample, such as the type of object in an image. It would be beneficial if we could use the additional information to condition the generator and generate from a subset of the learned outputs. Conditional GAN (cGAN) induces additional structure by including additional information into the generator and discriminator inputs. The generator adds the additional information to the random vector, whereas the discriminator adds it to the data to discriminate. Some of the works that utilize cGAN are MidiNet [124], Michelsanti and Tan [125], Chen et al. [126], Neekhara et al. [127], and V2RA-GAN [128].

Common issues with GAN include mode collapse, unstable training, and a lack of an evaluation metric [2]. Mode collapse occurs when the generator focuses exclusively on a few outputs that can trick the discriminator into thinking they are real. Even if the generator meets the discriminator requirements, we cannot use it to produce more than a few examples. This




Figure 2. Two deep learning architectures that appear to have little in common until we look closer. The generator mimics the auto-encoder’s decoder, whereas the discriminator resembles the encoder.

might happen because the discriminator is unable to force the generator to be diverse [123]. The Wasserstein GAN (WGAN) is a well-known variant for addressing this problem. WGAN shifts the discriminator’s job from distinguishing between real and forged data to computing the Wasserstein distance, commonly known as the Earth Mover’s distance. In addition, a modification to aid WGAN convergence has been proposed; it uses a gradient penalty rather than weight clipping and is known as WGAN-GP. WGAN was used by MuseGAN [129], WaveGAN [130], TiFGAN [131], and Catch-A-Waveform [132].

Another popular modification to the GAN architecture is the use of deep convolutional networks known as deep convolutional GANs (DCGAN). Unlike WGAN, DCGAN only requires a change to the model architecture, rather than the entire training procedure, for both the generator and discriminator. It aims to provide a stable learning environment in an unsupervised setting by applying a set of architectural constraints [123]. DCGAN is used in works such as MidiNet [124], WaveGAN [130], and TiFGAN [131].

Furthermore, it is worth noting a simple GAN extension designed to address the issue of vanishing gradients while simultaneously improving training stability. Least squares GAN (LSGAN) improves the quality of generated samples by altering the discriminator’s loss function. Unlike the regular GAN, LSGAN penalizes correctly classified samples much more, pulling them toward the decision boundary, which allows LSGAN to generate samples that are closer to the real data [133]. Papers using LSGAN include SEGAN [134], Yamamoto, Song, and Kim [135], HiFi-GAN [136], Parallel WaveGAN [137], Fre-GAN [138], VITS [105] and V2RAGAN [128].

There are many more modifications to GAN we haven’t mentioned, like the Cycle GAN [139] or the Boundary-Equilibrium GAN [140], as we tried to showcase the most prevalent modifications in the field of audio generation. Works like MelGAN [112], GAAE [141], GGAN [142], SEANet [143], EATS [144], Dance2Music-GAN [119] and Musika [145] use yet another type of loss called the hinge loss.

Finally, we’d like to mention works that were challenging to categorize. They are GANSynth [146], GAN-TTS [147], RegNet [148], Audeo [149], Multi-Band MelGAN [150], Multi-Singer [151] and DelightfulTTS 2 [122].

C. Normalizing flows

Although VAE and GAN were frequently utilized in audio generation, neither allowed for an exact evaluation of the probability density of new points [152]. Normalizing Flows (NF) are a family of generative models with tractable distributions that enable exact density evaluation and sampling. The network is made up of two “flows” that move in opposite directions. One flow starts with a base density, which we call noise, and progresses to a more complex density. The opposing flow reverses the direction, transforming the complex density back into the base density. The movement from base to complex is known as the generating direction, whereas the reverse is known as the normalizing direction. The term normalizing flow refers to the notion that the normalizing direction makes a complex distribution more regular, or normal. The normal distribution is typically used for base density, which is another reason for the name. Similar to how we layer transformations in a deep neural network, we compose several simple functions to generate complex behavior. These functions cannot be chosen arbitrarily because the flow must be in both directions; hence, the functions chosen must be invertible. Using a characteristic of the invertible function composition, we can create a likelihood-based estimation of the parameters that we can apply to train the model. In this setup, data generation is simple; utilizing the generative flow, we can input a sample from the base distribution and generate the required complex distribution sample. It has been formally proven that if you can build an arbitrarily complex transformation, you will be able to generate any distribution under reasonable assumptions [152].

Depending on the nature of the function employed in the flow, there can be significant performance differences that impact training or inference time. Inverse Autoregressive Flows (IAF) are a type of NF model with a specialized function that allows for efficient synthesis. The transform is based on an autoregressive network, which means that the current output is only determined by the current and previous input values. The advantage of this transformation is that the generative flow may be computed in parallel, allowing efficient use of resources such as the GPU. Although IAF networks can be run in parallel during inference, training with maximum likelihood estimation requires sequential processing. To allow for parallel training, a probability density distillation strategy is

used [153, 154]. In this method, we try to transfer knowledge from an already-trained teacher to a student model. Parallel WaveNet [153] and ClariNet [154] are two IAF models that employ this method. On the other hand, WaveGlow [155], FloWaveNet [156], and Glow-TTS [157] all utilize an affine coupling layer. Because this layer allows for both parallel training and inference, they can avoid the problems associated with the former. Other efforts that are worth mentioning are WaveNODE [158], which uses continuous normalizing flow, and WaveFlow [159], which uses a dilated 2-D convolutional architecture.

At the end of this section, we'd like to address a problem that can arise when using flow-based networks with audio data. Because audio is digitally stored in a discrete representation, training a continuous density model on discrete data might lead to poor model performance. Yoon et al. [160] presented audio dequantization methods that can be deployed in flow-based networks and improved audio generating quality.

D. Transformer networks

The majority of the material discussed in this section comes from Zhang et al. [161].

Before we can discuss transformers, we need to talk about attention. Attention has three components: a query, keys, and values. We have a database of (key, value) pairs, and our goal is to locate all values that closely match their key with the query. In the transformer, we improve on this concept by introducing a new type of attention known as self-attention. Self-attention includes three new functions that accept input and have learnable parameters. The functions change the input into one of the three previously mentioned components: query, key, and value. The prefix self refers to the fact that we utilize the same input for both the database and the query. If we were to translate a sentence, we would expect the translation of the n th word to be determined not only by itself but also by the other words in the sentence. For this example, the query would be the n th word and the database would be the sentence itself; if the parameters were learned correctly, we would expect to see relevant values for translation as the output of self-attention. To boost the model's capacity to capture both short- and long-term dependencies, we can concatenate numerous self-attention modules, each with its own set of parameters, resulting in multi-head self-attention. Furthermore, if we want to prevent the model from attending to future entries, we can use masked multi-head self-attention, which employs a mask to specify which future entries we wish to ignore.

The second essential element of the transformer is positional encoding. Instead of processing a sequence one at a time, the self-attention in the transformer provides parallel computing. The consequence is that the sequence's order is not preserved. The prevailing method for preserving order information is to feed the model with additional input associated with each token. These additional inputs are known as positional encodings. Position encoding can be absolute or relative, and it can be predefined or learned during training.

At last, the transformer, like an auto-encoder, has both an encoder and a decoder. Both the encoder and decoder are made

up of a stack of identical layers, each with two sublayers. The first sublayer is multi-head self-attention, whereas the second is a feed-forward network. In addition, each identical layer contains a residual connection surrounding both sublayers that follows layer normalization. Unlike the encoder, the decoder employs both encoder-decoder attention and masked multi-head self-attention at the input. The encoder-decoder attention is a normal multi-head attention with queries from the decoder and (key, value) pairs from the encoder. Before the input is fed into the network, positional embedding is applied.

Transformers were primarily intended for natural language processing but were then used for images with the vision transformer and lately for audio signals [162]. They have revolutionized modern deep learning by providing the ability to model long-term sequences [72]. On the other hand, transformers are generally referred to as data-hungry since they require a large amount of training data [162]. The attention mechanism's quadratic complexity makes it difficult to process long sequences [72]. To use transformers with audio, we would convert signals into visual spectrograms and divide them into "patches" that are then treated as separate input tokens, analogous to text [162]. There are many works that use the transformer architecture, including Music Transformer [163], FastSpeech [86], Wave2Midi2Wave [164], Li et al. [165], RobuTrans [166], Jukebox [114], AlignTTS [167], Multi-Track Music Machine [168], JDI-T [169], AdaSpeech [170], FastPitch [171], Verma and Chafe [72], Controllable Music Transformer [172], Lee et al. [173], SpeechT5 [120], CPS [174], FastSpeech 2 [87], FIGARO [116], HAT [175], ELMG [176], AudioLM [96], VALL-E [73], MusicLM [97], SingSong [98], SPEAR-TTS [177], AudioGen [178], VALL-E X [100], dGSLM [179], ViOLA [95], MuseCoco [180], Im2Wav [118], AudioPaLM [181], VampNet [182], LM-VC [183], UniAudio [184], and MusicGen [185].

LakhNES [186] and REMI [187] use Transformer-XL, an extension of the Transformer that can, in theory, encode arbitrary long contexts into fixed-length representations. This is accomplished by providing a recurrence mechanism [188], wherein the preceding segment is cached for later usage as an expanded context for the subsequent segment. Furthermore, to support the recurrence mechanism, it introduces an expanded positional encoding scheme known as relative positional encoding, which keeps positional information coherent when reusing states. In addition to Transformer-XL, Hawthorne et al. [189] and Yu et al. [190] presented Perceiver AR and Museformer as alternatives to tackle problems that require extended contexts.

Finally, another extension to the transformer has been successful for various speech tasks [191]. Convolution-augmented Transformer (Conformer) extends the Transformer by incorporating convolution and self-attention between two feed-forward modules; this cascade of modules is a single Conformer block. It integrates a relative positional encoding scheme, a method adopted from the described Transformer-XL to improve generalization for diverse input lengths [192]. Papers utilizing the conformer are SpeechNet [193], A³T [191], VQTTs [121], Popuri et al. [194], and SoundStorm [99].

E. Diffusion models

Diffusion models are generative models inspired by non-equilibrium thermodynamics [11]. Diffusion models, like normalizing flows, consist of two processes: forward and reverse. The forward process converts the data to a conventional Gaussian distribution by constructing a Markov chain of diffusion steps with a predetermined noise schedule. The reverse method gradually reconstructs data samples from the noise using an interference noise schedule. Unlike other architectures that change the distribution of data, such as variational auto-encoders and normalizing flows, diffusion models maintain the dimensionality of the latent variables fixed. Because the dimensionality of the latent variables must be fixed during the iterative generation process, which can result in slow inference speed in high-dimensional spaces [195]. A potential solution is to utilize a more compressed representation, such as a mel-spectrogram, instead of a short-time Fourier transform. Papers employing diffusion models include WaveGrad [196], DiffWave [197], Diff-TTS [198], Grad-TTS [199], DiffuSE [200], FastDiff [201], CDiffuSE [202], Guided-TTS [203], Guided-TTS 2 [204], DiffSinger [205], UNIVERSE [206], Diffsound [117], Noise2Music [207], DiffAVA [208], MeLoDy [209], Tango [110], SRTNet [210], MusicLDM [211], JEN-1 [212], AudioLDM [195], Bai et al. [213], ERNIE-Music [214], and Re-AudioLDM [215].

Transformer and diffusion models were the most popular designs discussed in this article. As a result, in the final half of this chapter, we will list some works that use both the transformer and diffusion models. These works include Hawthorne et al. [216], Make-An-Audio 2 [111], NaturalSpeech 2 [93], Grad-StyleSpeech [217], Make-An-Audio [218], AudioLDM 2 [219], and Moûsai [220].

VI. EVALUATION METRICS

Evaluations could be considered the most important piece of the puzzle. By introducing evaluations, we are able to quantify progress. We can compare, improve, and optimize our models, all thanks to evaluation metrics. We will not mention domain-specific evaluation metrics such as the character error rate used in text-to-speech or the perceptual evaluation of speech quality used in speech enhancement. There are many more widely used metrics that we will not mention in the following sections. Some of them are: Nearest neighbor comparisons, Number of statistically-different bins, Kernel Inception Distance, and CLIP score.

A. Human evaluation

As humans, we are constantly exposed to various sorts of sounds, which provides us with a wealth of expertise when attempting to distinguish between real and manufactured audio. The audio-generating method we are seeking to construct is intended to trick people into thinking the sound is a recording rather than synthesis. As a result, who better to judge the success of such systems than the ones we're attempting to fool? Human evaluation is the gold standard for assessing audio quality. The human ear is particularly sensitive to irregularities, which are disruptive for the listener [146].

Intuitively, it is simple to label an audio sample as good or bad, real or fake, but it is much more challenging to document a procedure derived from our thinking that may be used to evaluate future audio samples. The human assessment is often carried out with a defined number of listeners who listen and rate the audio on a 1-5 Likert scale. This type of test is termed the Mean-Opinion Score (MOS) [221]. While MOS is used to evaluate naturalness, similarity MOS is used to assess how similar the generated and real samples are [222]. Another metric, known as the comparative MOS, can be used to compare two systems by subtracting their MOS values. We may also calculate it by providing listeners with two audio samples generated by different models and immediately judging which one is better [165]. Oord et al. [153] discovered that preference scores from a paired comparison test, frequently referred to as the A/B test, were more reliable than the MOS score. Many alternative human evaluation metrics have been proposed for music; domain-specific metrics include melody, groove, consonance, coherence, and integrity. The biggest disadvantage of human evaluation is that the findings cannot be replicated exactly. This means that the concrete numbers in the evaluation are unimportant, and only the link between them is crucial. This stems from the inherent subjectivity of human evaluation as well as biases or predispositions for specific auditory features.

B. Inception score

The Inception Score (IS) is a perceptual metric that correlates with human evaluation. The Inception score is calculated by applying a pretrained Inception classifier to the generative model's output. The IS is defined as the mean Kullback-Leibler divergence between the conditional output class label distribution and the labels' marginal distribution. It evaluates the diversity and quality of the audio outputs and prefers generated samples that the model can confidently classify. With N samples, the measure ranges from 1 to N . The IS is maximized when the classifier is confident in every classification of the generated sample and each label is predicted equally often [130]. Normally, the Inception classifier is trained using the ImageNet dataset, which may not be compatible with audio spectrograms. This will cause the classifier to be unable to separate the data into meaningful categories, resulting in a low IS score. An extension to the IS called Modified Inception Score (mIS) measures the within-class diversity of samples in addition to the IS which favors sharp and clear samples [197].

C. Fréchet distance

The inception score is based solely on the generated samples, not taking into consideration the real samples [141]. The Fréchet Inception Distance (FID) score addresses this issue by comparing the generated samples with the real ones. The FID calculates the Fréchet distance between two distributions for both generated and real samples using distribution parameters taken from the intermediate layer of the pretrained Inception Network [141]. The lower the FID score, the higher the perceived generation quality. It is frequently used to assess the fidelity of generated samples in the image generation domain

[117]. This metric was found to correlate with perceptual quality and diversity on synthetic distributions [146]. The Inception Network is trained on the ImageNet dataset, which is purpose-built for images, but this does not ensure it will function for spectrograms. It may be unable to classify the spectrograms into any meaningful categories, resulting in unsatisfactory results [142].

Fréchet Audio Distance (FAD) is a perceptual metric adapted from the FID for the audio domain. Unlike reference-based metrics, FAD measures the distance between the generated audio distribution and the real audio distribution using a pretrained audio classifier that does not use reference audio samples. The VGGish model [223] is used to extract the characteristics of both generated and real audio [219]. As with the FID, the lower the score, the better the audio fidelity. According to Kreuk et al. [178], the FAD correlates well with human perceptions of audio quality. The FAD was found to be robust against noise, computationally efficient, consistent with human judgments, and sensitive to intra-class mode dropping [79]. Although FAD may indicate good audio quality, it does not necessarily indicate that the sample is desired or relevant [97]. For instance, in text-to-speech applications, low-FAD audio may be generated that does not match the input text. According to Bińkowski et al. [147], the FAD measure is not appropriate for evaluating text-to-speech models since it was created for music. While according to Zhu et al. [214], calculating the similarity between real and generated samples does not account for sample quality. Another similar metric called the Fréchet DeepSpeech Distance (FDSD) also uses the Fréchet distance on audio features extracted by a speech recognition model [8]. Donahue et al. [144] found the FDSD to be unreliable in their use case.

The last Fréchet metric that is important to discuss is the Fréchet Distance (FD). Unlike the FAD, which extracts features using the VGGish [223] model, FD employs the PANN [224] model. The model change enables the FD to use different audio representations as input. PANN [224] uses mel-spectrogram as input, whereas VGGish [223] uses raw waveform. FD evaluates audio quality using an audio embedding model to measure the similarity between the embedding space of generations and that of targets [211].

D. Kullback-Leibler divergence

Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence is a reference-dependent metric that computes the divergence between the generated and reference audio distributions. It uses a pretrained classifier to obtain the probabilities of generated and reference samples and then calculates the KL divergence between the distributions. The probabilities are computed over the class predictions of the pretrained classifier. A low KL divergence score may indicate that a generated audio sample shares concepts with the given reference [212]. In music, this could indicate that the created audio has similar acoustic characteristics [97]. While the FAD measure is more related to human perception [110], the KL measure reflects more on the broader audio concepts occurring in the sample [178].

VII. CONCLUSION

The development of deep learning methods has significantly changed the field of audio generation. In this work, we have presented three important parts of building a deep learning model for the task of audio generation. For audio representation, we have presented two long-standing champions and a third up-and-comer. We explained five architectures and listed work that implements them in the field of audio generation. Finally, we presented the four most common evaluations in the works we examined. While the first three architectures mentioned above seem to have lost importance in recent years, the transformer and diffusion models seem to have taken their place. This could be due to the popularization of large language models such as ChatGPT or, in the case of the diffusion models, diffusion-based text-to-image generators.

With the ever-increasing computing power and availability of large databases, it looks like the age of deep learning has only just begun. Just as deep learning has allowed us to move from domain-dependent features and methods to a more universal solution, more recent work has attempted to move from a single task or purpose to a multi-task or even multi-modality model.

REFERENCES

- [1] Geoffroy Peeters and Gaël Richard. "Deep Learning for Audio and Music". In: *Multi-Faceted Deep Learning*. Ed. by Jenny Benois-Pineau and Akka Zemhari. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2021. pp. 231–266. ISBN: 978-3-030-74477-9. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-030-74478-6_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-74478-6_10).
- [2] Yuanjun Zhao, Xianjun Xia, and Roberto Togneri. "Applications of Deep Learning to Audio Generation". In: *IEEE Circuits and Systems Magazine* 19.4 (2019), pp. 19–38. ISSN: 1558-0830. DOI: [10.1109/MCAS.2019.2945210](https://doi.org/10.1109/MCAS.2019.2945210).
- [3] Hendrik Purwins et al. "Deep Learning for Audio Signal Processing". In: *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing* 13.2 (May 2019), pp. 206–219. ISSN: 1941-0484. DOI: [10.1109/JSTSP.2019.2908700](https://doi.org/10.1109/JSTSP.2019.2908700).
- [4] Jean-Pierre Briot, Gaëtan Hadjeres, and François-David Pachet. *Deep Learning Techniques for Music Generation – A Survey*. Aug. 7, 2019. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.1709.01620](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1709.01620). arXiv: [1709.01620](https://arxiv.org/abs/1709.01620) [cs]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1709.01620>, preprint.
- [5] M. Huzaifah and L. Wyse. *Deep Generative Models for Musical Audio Synthesis*. Nov. 25, 2020. arXiv: [2006.06426](https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.06426) [cs, eess, stat]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2006.06426>, preprint.
- [6] Xu Tan et al. *A Survey on Neural Speech Synthesis*. July 23, 2021. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2106.15561](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2106.15561). arXiv: [2106.15561](https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.15561) [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2106.15561>, preprint.
- [7] Zhaofeng Shi. *A Survey on Audio Synthesis and Audio-Visual Multimodal Processing*. Aug. 1, 2021. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2108.00443](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2108.00443). arXiv: [2108.00443](https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.00443) [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2108.00443>, preprint.
- [8] Anastasia Natsiou and Seán O'Leary. "Audio Representations for Deep Learning in Sound Synthesis: A Review". In: *2021 IEEE/ACIS 18th International Conference on Computer Systems and Applications (AICCSA)*. 2021 IEEE/ACIS 18th International Conference on Computer Systems and Applications (AICCSA). Nov. 2021, pp. 1–8. DOI: [10.1109/AICCSA53542.2021.9686838](https://doi.org/10.1109/AICCSA53542.2021.9686838).
- [9] Siddique Latif et al. *Transformers in Speech Processing: A Survey*. Mar. 21, 2023. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2303.11607](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.11607). arXiv: [2303.11607](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.11607) [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2303.11607>, preprint.
- [10] Chenshuang Zhang et al. *A Survey on Audio Diffusion Models: Text To Speech Synthesis and Enhancement in Generative AI*. Apr. 2, 2023. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2303.13336](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.13336). arXiv: [2303.13336](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.13336) [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2303.13336>, preprint.
- [11] Ambuj Mehrish et al. "A Review of Deep Learning Techniques for Speech Processing". In: *Information Fusion* 99 (Nov. 1, 2023), p. 101869. ISSN: 1566-2535. DOI: [10.1016/j.inffus.2023.101869](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2023.101869).
- [12] Zhen-Hua Ling et al. "Deep Learning for Acoustic Modeling in Parametric Speech Generation: A Systematic Review of Existing Techniques and Future Trends". In: *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine* 32.3 (May 2015), pp. 35–52. ISSN: 1558-0792. DOI: [10.1109/MSP.2014.2359987](https://doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2014.2359987).
- [13] Jacob Benesty, M. Mohan Sondhi, and Yiteng Arden Huang, eds. *Springer Handbook of Speech Processing*. Springer Handbooks. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2008. ISBN: 978-3-540-49127-9. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-540-49127-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-49127-9).
- [14] Tomoki Toda and Keiichi Tokuda. "A Speech Parameter Generation Algorithm Considering Global Variance for HMM-Based Speech Synthesis". In: *IEICE TRANSACTIONS on Information and Systems* E90-D.5 (May 1, 2007), pp. 816–824. ISSN: 1745-1361, 0916-8532.
- [15] Paul Taylor. *Text-to-Speech Synthesis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. ISBN: 978-0-521-89927-7. DOI: [10.1017/CBO9780511816338](https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511816338).
- [16] A. M. Liberman et al. "Minimal Rules for Synthesizing Speech". In: *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 31.11 (Nov. 1, 1959), pp. 1490–1499. ISSN: 0001-4966. DOI: [10.1121/1.1907654](https://doi.org/10.1121/1.1907654).
- [17] J. N. Holmes, Ignatius G. Mattingly, and J. N. Shearme. "Speech Synthesis by Rule". In: *Language and Speech* 7.3 (July 1, 1964), pp. 127–143. ISSN: 0023-8309. DOI: [10.1177/002383096400700301](https://doi.org/10.1177/002383096400700301).
- [18] C. Coker, N. Umeda, and C. Browman. "Automatic Synthesis from Ordinary English Text". In: *IEEE Transactions on Audio and Electroacoustics* 21.3 (June 1973), pp. 293–298. ISSN: 1558-2582. DOI: [10.1109/TAU.1973.1162458](https://doi.org/10.1109/TAU.1973.1162458).

- [19] D. Klatt. "Structure of a Phonological Rule Component for a Synthesis-by-Rule Program". In: *IEEE Transactions on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing* 24.5 (Oct. 1976), pp. 391–398. ISSN: 0096-3518. DOI: 10.1109/TASSP.1976.1162847.
- [20] N. Dixon and H. Maxey. "Terminal Analog Synthesis of Continuous Speech Using the Diphone Method of Segment Assembly". In: *IEEE Transactions on Audio and Electroacoustics* 16.1 (Mar. 1968), pp. 40–50. ISSN: 0018-9278. DOI: 10.1109/TAU.1968.1161948.
- [21] Y. Sagisaka. "Speech Synthesis by Rule Using an Optimal Selection of Non-Uniform Synthesis Units". In: ICASSP-88, International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing. IEEE Computer Society, Jan. 1, 1988, pp. 679, 680, 681, 682–679, 680, 681, 682. DOI: 10.1109/ICASSP.1988.196677.
- [22] A.J. Hunt and A.W. Black. "Unit Selection in a Concatenative Speech Synthesis System Using a Large Speech Database". In: *1996 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing Conference Proceedings*. 1996 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing Conference Proceedings. Vol. 1. May 1996, 373–376 vol. 1. DOI: 10.1109/ICASSP.1996.541110.
- [23] Heiga Zen, Keiichi Tokuda, and Alan W. Black. "Statistical Parametric Speech Synthesis". In: *Speech Communication* 51.11 (Nov. 1, 2009), pp. 1039–1064. ISSN: 0167-6393. DOI: 10.1016/j.specom.2009.04.004.
- [24] Kazuhiro Nakamura et al. "Integration of Spectral Feature Extraction and Modeling for HMM-Based Speech Synthesis". In: *IEICE Transactions on Information and Systems* E97.D.6 (2014), pp. 1438–1448. ISSN: 0916-8532, 1745-1361. DOI: 10.1587/transinf.E97.D.1438.
- [25] Takayoshi Yoshimura et al. "Simultaneous Modeling of Spectrum, Pitch and Duration in HMM-based Speech Synthesis". In: *6th European Conference on Speech Communication and Technology (Eurospeech 1999)*. 6th European Conference on Speech Communication and Technology (Eurospeech 1999). ISCA, Sept. 5, 1999, pp. 2347–2350. DOI: 10.21437/Eurospeech.1999-513.
- [26] Keiichi Tokuda, Heiga Zen, and Alan W. Black. "An HMM-based Speech Synthesis System Applied to English". In: *Proc. IEEE Workshop on Speech Synthesis, 2002* (2002). Keiichi Tokuda et al. "Speech Synthesis Based on Hidden Markov Models". In: *Proceedings of the IEEE* 101.5 (May 2013), pp. 1234–1252. ISSN: 1558-2256. DOI: 10.1109/JPROC.2013.2251852.
- [27] Heiga Zen, Andrew Senior, and Mike Schuster. "Statistical Parametric Speech Synthesis Using Deep Neural Networks". In: *2013 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*. 2013 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing. May 2013, pp. 7962–7966. DOI: 10.1109/ICASSP.2013.6639215.
- [28] J. Burniston and K.M. Curtis. "A Hybrid Neural Network/Rule Based Architecture for Diphone Speech Synthesis". In: *Proceedings of ICSPINN '94. International Conference on Speech, Image Processing and Neural Networks*. Proceedings of ICSPINN '94. International Conference on Speech, Image Processing and Neural Networks. Apr. 1994, 323–326 vol.1. DOI: 10.1109/SIPINN.1994.344901.
- [29] Zhen-Hua Ling, Li Deng, and Dong Yu. "Modeling Spectral Envelopes Using Restricted Boltzmann Machines and Deep Belief Networks for Statistical Parametric Speech Synthesis". In: *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing* 21.10 (Oct. 2013), pp. 2129–2139. ISSN: 1558-7924. DOI: 10.1109/TASL.2013.2269291.
- [30] T. Weijters and J. Thole. "Speech Synthesis with Artificial Neural Networks". In: *IEEE International Conference on Neural Networks*. IEEE International Conference on Neural Networks. Mar. 1993, 1764–1769 vol.3. DOI: 10.1109/ICNN.1993.298824.
- [31] Heng Lu, Simon King, and Oliver Watts. "Combining a Vector Space Representation of Linguistic Context with a Deep Neural Network for Text-To-Speech Synthesis". In: *8th ISCA Speech Synthesis Workshop*. 8th ISCA Speech Synthesis Workshop. Aug. 1, 2013, pp. 261–265.
- [32] Yuchen Fan et al. "Multi-Speaker Modeling and Speaker Adaptation for DNN-based TTS Synthesis". In: *2015 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. 2015 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP). Apr. 2015, pp. 4475–4479. DOI: 10.1109/ICASSP.2015.7178817.
- [33] Keiichi Tokuda and Heiga Zen. "Directly Modeling Speech Waveforms by Neural Networks for Statistical Parametric Speech Synthesis". In: *2015 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. 2015 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP). Apr. 2015, pp. 4215–4219. DOI: 10.1109/ICASSP.2015.7178765.
- [34] Orhan Karaali, Gerald Corrigan, and Ira Gerson. *Speech Synthesis with Neural Networks*. Nov. 24, 1998. arXiv: cs/9811031. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/cs/9811031>. preprint.
- [35] Orhan Karaali et al. *Text-To-Speech Conversion with Neural Networks: A Recurrent TDNN Approach*. Nov. 24, 1998. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.cs/9811032. arXiv: cs/9811032. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/cs/9811032>. preprint.
- [36] Yuchen Fan et al. "TTS Synthesis with Bidirectional LSTM Based Recurrent Neural Networks". In: *Interspeech 2014*. Interspeech 2014. ISCA, Sept. 14, 2014, pp. 1964–1968. DOI: 10.21437/Interspeech.2014-443.
- [37] Heiga Zen and Haşım Sak. "Unidirectional Long Short-Term Memory Recurrent Neural Network with Recurrent Output Layer for Low-Latency Speech Synthesis". In: *2015 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. 2015 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP). Apr. 2015, pp. 4470–4474. DOI: 10.1109/ICASSP.2015.7178816.
- [38] Bo Li and Heiga Zen. "Multi-Language Multi-Speaker Acoustic Modeling for LSTM-RNN Based Statistical Parametric Speech Synthesis". In: *Interspeech 2016*. Interspeech 2016. ISCA, Sept. 8, 2016, pp. 2468–2472. DOI: 10.21437/Interspeech.2016-172.
- [39] Keiichi Tokuda and Heiga Zen. "Directly Modeling Voiced and Unvoiced Components in Speech Waveforms by Neural Networks". In: *2016 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. 2016 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP). Mar. 2016, pp. 5640–5644. DOI: 10.1109/ICASSP.2016.7472757.
- [40] Wenfu Wang, Shuang Xu, and Bo Xu. "Gating Recurrent Mixture Density Networks for Acoustic Modeling in Statistical Parametric Speech Synthesis". In: *2016 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. 2016 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP). Mar. 2016, pp. 5520–5524. DOI: 10.1109/ICASSP.2016.7472733.
- [41] Wenfu Wang, Shuang Xu, and Bo Xu. "First Step Towards End-to-End Parametric TTS Synthesis: Generating Spectral Parameters with Neural Attention". In: *Interspeech 2016*. Interspeech 2016. ISCA, Sept. 8, 2016, pp. 2243–2247. DOI: 10.21437/Interspeech.2016-134.
- [42] Heiga Zen and Andrew Senior. "Deep Mixture Density Networks for Acoustic Modeling in Statistical Parametric Speech Synthesis". In: *2014 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. 2014 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP). May 2014, pp. 3844–3848. DOI: 10.1109/ICASSP.2014.6854321.
- [43] Kanishka Rao et al. "Grapheme-to-Phoneme Conversion Using Long Short-Term Memory Recurrent Neural Networks". In: *2015 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. 2015 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP). Apr. 2015, pp. 4225–4229. DOI: 10.1109/ICASSP.2015.7178767.
- [44] Kaisheng Yao and Geoffrey Zweig. *Sequence-to-Sequence Neural Net Models for Grapheme-to-Phoneme Conversion*. Aug. 20, 2015. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.1506.00196. arXiv: 1506.00196 [cs]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1506.00196>. preprint.
- [45] S. Imai. "Cepstral Analysis Synthesis on the Mel Frequency Scale". In: ICASSP '83. *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*. ICASSP '83. IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing. Vol. 8. Apr. 1983, pp. 93–96. DOI: 10.1109/ICASSP.1983.1172250.
- [46] Hideki Kawahara, Ikuyo Masuda-Katsuse, and Alain de Cheveigné. "Restructuring Speech Representations Using a Pitch-Adaptive Time-Frequency Smoothing and an Instantaneous-Frequency-Based F0 Extraction: Possible Role of a Repetitive Structure in Sounds!". In: *Speech Communication* 27.3 (Apr. 1, 1999), pp. 187–207. ISSN: 0167-6393. DOI: 10.1016/S0167-6393(98)00085-5.
- [47] Yannis Agiomyrgiannakis. "Vocaine the Vocoder and Applications in Speech Synthesis". In: *2015 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. 2015 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP). Apr. 2015, pp. 4230–4234. DOI: 10.1109/ICASSP.2015.7178768.
- [48] Victor Lavrenko and Jeremy Picketts. "Polyphonic Music Modeling with Random Fields". In: *Proceedings of the Eleventh ACM International Conference on Multimedia*. MULTIMEDIA '03. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, Nov. 2, 2003, pp. 120–129. ISBN: 978-1-58113-722-4. DOI: 10.1145/957013.957041.
- [49] J. D. Fernandez and F. Vico. "AI Methods in Algorithmic Composition: A Comprehensive Survey". In: *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 48 (Nov. 17, 2013), pp. 513–582. ISSN: 1076-9757. DOI: 10.1613/jair.3908.
- [50] Jeff Pressing. "Nonlinear Maps as Generators of Musical Design". In: *Computer Music Journal* 12.2 (1988), pp. 35–46. ISSN: 0148-9267. DOI: 10.2307/3679940. JSTOR: 3679940.
- [51] Charles Dodge and Thomas A. Jerse. *Computer Music: Synthesis, Composition, and Performance*. 1st print. London: Macmillan, 1985. 383 pp. ISBN: 978-0-02-873100-1.
- [52] Francesco Giomi and Marco Ligabue. "Computational Generation and Study of Jazz Music". In: *Interface* 20.1 (Jan. 1, 1991), pp. 47–64. ISSN: 0303-3902. DOI: 10.1080/09298219108570576.
- [53] Charles Ames and Michael Domino. "Cybernetic Composer: An Overview". In: *Understanding Music with AI: Perspectives on Music Cognition*. Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press, Aug. 17, 1992, pp. 186–205. ISBN: 978-0-262-52170-3.
- [54] John Biles. "GenJam: A Genetic Algorithm for Generating Jazz Solos". In: *ICMC*. Vol. 94. Ann Arbor, MI, 1994, pp. 131–137.
- [55] Artemis Moroni et al. "Vox Populi: An Interactive Evolutionary System for Algorithmic Music Composition". In: *Leonardo Music Journal* 10 (Dec. 1, 2000), pp. 49–54. ISSN: 0961-1215. DOI: 10.1162/096112100570602.
- [56] C.-C.J. Chen and R. Miiikkulainen. "Creating Melodies with Evolving Recurrent Neural Networks". In: *IJCNN'01. International Joint Conference on Neural Networks. Proceedings (Cat. No.01CH37222)*. IJCNN'01. International Joint Conference on Neural Networks. Proceedings (Cat. No.01CH37222). Vol. 3. July 2001, 2241–2246 vol.3. DOI: 10.1109/IJCNN.2001.938515.
- [57] Alfonso Ortega de la Puente, Rafael Sánchez Alfonso, and Manuel Alfonseca Moreno. "Automatic Composition of Music by Means of Grammatical Evolution". In: *Proceedings of the 2002 Conference on APL: Array Processing Languages: Lore, Problems, and Applications*. APL '02. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, June 1, 2002, pp. 148–155. ISBN: 978-1-58113-577-0. DOI: 10.1145/602231.602249.
- [58] MICHAEL C. MOZER. "Neural Network Music Composition by Prediction: Exploring the Benefits of Psychoacoustic Constraints and multi-scale Processing". In: *Connection Science* 6.2-3 (Jan. 1, 1994), pp. 247–280. ISSN: 0954-0091. DOI: 10.1080/0954009408915726.
- [59] Douglas Eck and Juergen Schmidhuber. "A First Look at Music Composition Using Lstm Recurrent Neural Networks". In: *Istituto Dalle Molle Di Studi Sull Intelligenza Artificiale* 103.4 (2002), pp. 48–56.
- [60] Hang Chu, Raquel Urtasun, and Sanja Fidler. *Song From PI: A Musically Plausible Network for Pop Music Generation*. Nov. 10, 2016. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.1611.03477. arXiv: 1611.03477 [cs]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1611.03477>. preprint.
- [61] Allen Huang and Raymond Wu. *Deep Learning for Music*. June 15, 2016. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.1606.04930. arXiv: 1606.04930 [cs]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1606.04930>. preprint.
- [62] Olof Mogren. *C-RNN-GAN: Continuous Recurrent Neural Networks with Adversarial Training*. Nov. 29, 2016. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.1611.09904. arXiv: 1611.09904 [cs]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1611.09904>. preprint.
- [63] Kevin Jones. "Compositional Applications of Stochastic Processes". In: *Computer Music Journal* 5.2 (1981), pp. 45–61. ISSN: 0148-9267. DOI: 10.2307/3679879. JSTOR: 3679879.
- [64] Kohonen. "A Self-Learning Musical Grammar, or 'Associative Memory of the Second Kind'". In: *International 1989 Joint Conference on Neural Networks*. International 1989 Joint Conference on Neural Networks. 1989, 1–5 vol.1. DOI: 10.1109/IJCNN.1989.118852.
- [65] Teuvo Kohonen et al. "A Nonheuristic Automatic Composing Method". In: *Music and Connectionism*. Ed. by Peter M. Todd and Gareth Loy. The MIT Press, Oct. 9, 1991, pp. 229–242. ISBN: 978-0-262-28503-2. DOI: 10.7551/mitpress/4804.003.0020.
- [66] Eduardo Reck Miranda. "Granular Synthesis of Sounds by Means of a Cellular Automaton". In: *Leonardo* 28.4 (1995), pp. 297–300. ISSN: 0024-094X. DOI: 10.2307/1576193. JSTOR: 1576193.
- [67] Peter Worth and Susan Stepney. "Growing Music: Musical Interpretations of L-Systems". In: *Applications of Evolutionary Computing*. Ed. by Franz Rothlauf et al. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 2005, pp. 545–550. ISBN: 978-3-540-32003-6. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-540-32003-6_56.
- [68] Michael Chan, John Potter, and Emery Schubert. "Improving Algorithmic Music Composition with Machine Learning". In: *9th International Conference on Music Perception and Cognition*. Citeseer, 2006, pp. 1848–1854.
- [69] Nicolas Boulanger-Lewandowski, Yoshua Bengio, and Pascal Vincent. *Modeling Temporal Dependencies in High-Dimensional Sequences: Application to Polyphonic Music Generation and Transcription*. June 27, 2012. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.1206.6392. arXiv: 1206.6392 [cs, stat]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1206.6392>. preprint.
- [70] H. S. Black and J. O. Edson. "Pulse Code Modulation". In: *Transactions of the American Institute of Electrical Engineers* 66.1 (Jan. 1947), pp. 895–899. ISSN: 2330-9431. DOI: 10.1109/T-AIEE.1947.5059525.
- [71] Prateek Verma and Chris Chafe. "A Generative Model for Raw Audio Using Transformer Architectures". In: *2021 24th International Conference on Digital Audio Effects (DAFx)*. 2021 24th International Conference on Digital Audio Effects (DAFx). Sept. 2021, pp. 230–237. DOI: 10.23919/DAFx51585.2021.9768298.
- [72] Chengyi Wang et al. *Neural Codec Language Models Are Zero-Shot Text to Speech Synthesizers*. Jan. 5, 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2301.02111. arXiv: 2301.02111 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2301.02111>. preprint.

- [74] Aaron van den Oord et al. *WaveNet: A Generative Model for Raw Audio*. Sept. 19, 2016. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.1609.03499. arXiv: 1609.03499 [cs]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1609.03499>. preprint.
- [75] Sander Dieleman, Aaron van den Oord, and Karen Simonyan. “The Challenge of Realistic Music Generation: Modelling Raw Audio at Scale”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Vol. 31. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018.
- [76] Sorush Mehri et al. *SampleRNN: An Unconditional End-to-End Neural Audio Generation Model*. Feb. 11, 2017. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.1612.07837. arXiv: 1612.07837 [cs]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1612.07837>. preprint.
- [77] Wei Ping et al. *Deep Voice 3: Scaling Text-to-Speech with Convolutional Sequence Learning*. Feb. 22, 2018. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.1710.07654. arXiv: 1710.07654 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1710.07654>. preprint.
- [78] Paolo Prandoni and Martin Vetterli. *Signal Processing for Communications*. EPFL Press, Aug. 19, 2008. 400 pp. ISBN: 978-1-4200-7046-0. Google Books: tKUYsRbM4gYC.
- [79] Javier Nistal, Stefan Lattner, and Gaël Richard. “Comparing Representations for Audio Synthesis Using Generative Adversarial Networks”. In: *2020 28th European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO)*. 2020 28th European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO). Jan. 2021, pp. 161–165. DOI: 10.23919/EUSIPCO47968.2020.9287799.
- [80] D. Griffin and Jae Lim. “Signal Estimation from Modified Short-Time Fourier Transform”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing* 32.2 (Apr. 1984), pp. 236–243. ISSN: 0096-3518. DOI: 10.1109/TASSP.1984.1164317.
- [81] Rémi Decorsière et al. “Inversion of Auditory Spectrograms, Traditional Spectrograms, and Other Envelope Representations”. In: *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing* 23.1 (Jan. 2015), pp. 46–56. ISSN: 2329-9304. DOI: 10.1109/TASLP.2014.2367821.
- [82] Gerald T. Bearegard, Mithila Harish, and Lonce Wyse. “Single Pass Spectrogram Inversion”. In: *2015 IEEE International Conference on Digital Signal Processing (DSP)*. 2015 IEEE International Conference on Digital Signal Processing (DSP), July 2015, pp. 427–431. DOI: 10.1109/ICDSP.2015.7251907.
- [83] Zdeněk Průša, Peter Balázs, and Peter Lempel Søndergaard. “A Noniterative Method for Reconstruction of Phase From STFT Magnitude”. In: *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing* 25.5 (May 2017), pp. 1154–1164. ISSN: 2329-9304. DOI: 10.1109/TASLP.2017.2678166.
- [84] Yuxuan Wang et al. *Tacotron: Towards End-to-End Speech Synthesis*. Apr. 6, 2017. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.1703.10135. arXiv: 1703.10135 [cs]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1703.10135>. preprint.
- [85] Jonathan Shen et al. “Natural TTS Synthesis by Conditioning Wavenet on MEL Spectrogram Predictions”. In: *2018 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. 2018 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP). Apr. 2018, pp. 4779–4783. DOI: 10.1109/ICASSP.2018.8461368.
- [86] Yi Ren et al. “FastSpeech: Fast, Robust and Controllable Text to Speech”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Vol. 32. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019.
- [87] Yi Ren et al. *FastSpeech 2: Fast and High-Quality End-to-End Text to Speech*. Aug. 7, 2022. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2006.04558. arXiv: 2006.04558 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2006.04558>. preprint.
- [88] Keunwoo Choi et al. “A Comparison of Audio Signal Preprocessing Methods for Deep Neural Networks on Music Tagging”. In: *2018 26th European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO)*. 2018 26th European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO), Sept. 2018, pp. 1870–1874. DOI: 10.23919/EUSIPCO.2018.8553106.
- [89] Alexandre Défossez et al. *High Fidelity Neural Audio Compression*. Oct. 24, 2022. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2210.13438. arXiv: 2210.13438 [cs, eess, stat]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2210.13438>. preprint.
- [90] Neil Zeghidour et al. “SoundStream: An End-to-End Neural Audio Codec”. In: *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing* 30 (2022), pp. 495–507. ISSN: 2329-9304. DOI: 10.1109/TASLP.2021.3129994.
- [91] Yang Ai et al. *APCodec: A Neural Audio Codec with Parallel Amplitude and Phase Spectrum Encoding and Decoding*. Feb. 16, 2024. arXiv: 2402.10533 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2402.10533>. preprint.
- [92] Yi-Chiao Wu et al. “AudioDec: An Open-source Streaming High-fidelity Neural Audio Codec”. In: *ICASSP 2023 - 2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. June 4, 2023, pp. 1–5. DOI: 10.1109/ICASSP49357.2023.10096509. arXiv: 2305.16608 [eess].
- [93] Kai Shen et al. *NaturalSpeech 2: Latent Diffusion Models Are Natural and Zero-Shot Speech and Singing Synthesizers*. May 30, 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2304.09116. arXiv: 2304.09116 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2304.09116>. preprint.
- [94] Dongchao Yang et al. *HiFi-CODEC: Group-residual Vector Quantization for High Fidelity Audio Codec*. May 7, 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2305.02765. arXiv: 2305.02765 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2305.02765>. preprint.
- [95] Tianrui Wang et al. *VioLA: Unified Codec Language Models for Speech Recognition, Synthesis, and Translation*. May 25, 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2305.16107. arXiv: 2305.16107 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2305.16107>. preprint.
- [96] Zalan Borsos et al. “AudioLM: A Language Modeling Approach to Audio Generation”. In: *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing* 31 (2023), pp. 2523–2533. ISSN: 2329-9304. DOI: 10.1109/TASLP.2023.3288409.
- [97] Andrea Agostinelli et al. *MusLM: Generating Music From Text*. Jan. 26, 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2301.11325. arXiv: 2301.11325 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2301.11325>. preprint.
- [98] Chris Donahue et al. *SingSong: Generating Musical Accompaniments from Singing*. Jan. 29, 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2301.12662. arXiv: 2301.12662 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2301.12662>. preprint.
- [99] Zalan Borsos et al. *SoundStorm: Efficient Parallel Audio Generation*. May 16, 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2305.09636. arXiv: 2305.09636 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2305.09636>. preprint.
- [100] Ziqiang Zhang et al. *Speak Foreign Languages with Your Own Voice: Cross-Lingual Neural Codec Language Modeling*. Mar. 7, 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2303.03926. arXiv: 2303.03926 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2303.03926>. preprint.
- [101] Xiaofei Wang et al. *SpeechX: Neural Codec Language Model as a Versatile Speech Transformer*. Aug. 13, 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2308.06873. arXiv: 2308.06873 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2308.06873>. preprint.
- [102] Ian Goodfellow, Yoshua Bengio, and Aaron Courville. *Deep Learning*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press, Nov. 18, 2016. 800 pp. ISBN: 978-0-262-03561-3.
- [103] Diederik P. Kingma and Max Welling. “An Introduction to Variational Autoencoders”. In: *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning* 12.4 (Nov. 27, 2019), pp. 307–392. ISSN: 1935-8237, 1935-8245. DOI: 10.1561/22000000056.
- [104] Hu-Cheng Lee et al. “Audio Feature Generation for Missing Modality Problem in Video Action Recognition”. In: *ICASSP 2019 - 2019 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. ICASSP 2019 - 2019 IEEE International Confer-
- ence on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP). May 2019, pp. 3956–3960. DOI: 10.1109/ICASSP.2019.8682513.
- [105] Jaehyeon Kim, Jungil Kong, and Juhee Son. “Conditional Variational Autoencoder with Adversarial Learning for End-to-End Text-to-Speech”. In: *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*. International Conference on Machine Learning. PMLR, July 1, 2021, pp. 5530–5540.
- [106] Adam Roberts et al. “A Hierarchical Latent Vector Model for Learning Long-Term Structure in Music”. In: *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*. International Conference on Machine Learning. PMLR, July 3, 2018, pp. 4364–4373.
- [107] Yixiao Zhang et al. “BUTTER: A Representation Learning Framework for Bi-directional Music-Sentence Retrieval and Generation”. In: *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on NLP for Music and Audio (NLP4MusA)*. NLP4MusA 2020. Ed. by Sergio Oramas et al. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics, 2020, pp. 54–58.
- [108] Hao Hao Tan and Dorien Herremans. *Music FaderNets: Controllable Music Generation Based On High-Level Features via Low-Level Feature Modelling*. July 29, 2020. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2007.15474. arXiv: 2007.15474 [cs, eess, stat]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2007.15474>. preprint.
- [109] Antoine Caillon and Philippe Esling. *RAVE: A Variational Autoencoder for Fast and High-Quality Neural Audio Synthesis*. Dec. 15, 2021. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2111.05011. arXiv: 2111.05011 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2111.05011>. preprint.
- [110] Deepanway Ghosal et al. *Text-to-Audio Generation Using Instruction-Tuned LLM and Latent Diffusion Model*. May 29, 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2304.13731. arXiv: 2304.13731 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2304.13731>. preprint.
- [111] Jiawei Huang et al. *Make-An-Audio 2: Temporal-Enhanced Text-to-Audio Generation*. May 29, 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2305.18474. arXiv: 2305.18474 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2305.18474>. preprint.
- [112] Kundan Kumar et al. “MelGAN: Generative Adversarial Networks for Conditional Waveform Synthesis”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Vol. 32. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019.
- [113] Andros Tjandra et al. *VQVAE Unsupervised Unit Discovery and Multi-scale Code2Spec Inverter for Zerospeech Challenge 2019*. May 29, 2019. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.1905.11449. arXiv: 1905.11449 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1905.11449>. preprint.
- [114] Prafulla Dhariwal et al. *Jukebox: A Generative Model for Music*. Apr. 30, 2020. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2005.00341. arXiv: 2005.00341 [cs, eess, stat]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2005.00341>. preprint.
- [115] Tomoki Hayashi and Shinji Watanabe. *DiscreteTalk: Text-to-Speech as a Machine Translation Problem*. May 11, 2020. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2005.05525. arXiv: 2005.05525 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2005.05525>. preprint.
- [116] Dimitri von Rütte et al. “FIGARO: Controllable Music Generation Using Learned and Expert Features”. In: The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations. Sept. 29, 2022.
- [117] Dongchao Yang et al. “DiffSound: Discrete Diffusion Model for Text-to-Sound Generation”. In: *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing* 31 (2023), pp. 1720–1733. ISSN: 2329-9304. DOI: 10.1109/TASLP.2023.3268730.
- [118] Roy Sheffer and Yossi Adi. “I Hear Your True Colors: Image Guided Audio Generation”. In: *ICASSP 2023 - 2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. ICASSP 2023 - 2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP). June 2023, pp. 1–5. DOI: 10.1109/ICASSP49357.2023.10096023.
- [119] Ye Zhu et al. “Quantized GAN for Complex Music Generation from Dance Videos”. In: *Computer Vision - ECCV 2022*. Ed. by Shai Avidan et al. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 2022, pp. 182–199. ISBN: 978-3-031-19836-6. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-031-19836-6_11.
- [120] Junyi Ao et al. *SpeechT5: Unified-Modal Encoder-Decoder Pre-Training for Spoken Language Processing*. May 24, 2022. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2110.07205. arXiv: 2110.07205 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2110.07205>. preprint.
- [121] Chengpu Du et al. *VQTTs: High-Fidelity Text-to-Speech Synthesis with Self-Supervised VQ Acoustic Feature*. June 30, 2022. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2204.00768. arXiv: 2204.00768 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2204.00768>. preprint.
- [122] Yanqing Liu et al. *DelightfulTTS 2: End-to-End Speech Synthesis with Adversarial Vector-Quantized Auto-Encoders*. July 11, 2022. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2207.04646. arXiv: 2207.04646 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2207.04646>. preprint.
- [123] Norberto Torres-Reyes and Shahram Latifi. “Audio Enhancement and Synthesis Using Generative Adversarial Networks: A Survey”. In: *International Journal of Computer Applications* 182.35 (Jan. 17, 2019), pp. 27–31. ISSN: 09758887. DOI: 10.5120/ijca201918334.
- [124] Li-Chia Yang, Szu-Yu Chou, and Yi-Hsuan Yang. *MidiNet: A Convolutional Generative Adversarial Network for Symbolic-domain Music Generation*. July 18, 2017. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.1703.10847. arXiv: 1703.10847 [cs]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1703.10847>. preprint.
- [125] Daniel Michelsanti and Zheng-Hua Tan. “Conditional Generative Adversarial Networks for Speech Enhancement and Noise-Robust Speaker Verification”. In: *Interspeech 2017*. Aug. 20, 2017, pp. 2008–2012. DOI: 10.21437/Interspeech.2017-1620. arXiv: 1709.01703 [cs, eess, stat].
- [126] Lele Chen et al. “Deep Cross-Modal Audio-Visual Generation”. In: *Proceedings of the on Thematic Workshops of ACM Multimedia 2017*. Thematic Workshops ’17. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, Oct. 23, 2017, pp. 349–357. ISBN: 978-1-4503-5416-5. DOI: 10.1145/3126686.3126723.
- [127] Paarth Neekhra et al. *Expediting TTS Synthesis with Adversarial Vocoder*. July 25, 2019. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.1904.07944. arXiv: 1904.07944 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1904.07944>. preprint.
- [128] Shiguang Liu, Sijia Li, and Haonan Cheng. “Towards an End-to-End Visual-to-Raw-Audio Generation With GAN”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology* 32.3 (Mar. 2022), pp. 1299–1312. ISSN: 1558-2205. DOI: 10.1109/TCSVT.2021.3079897.
- [129] Hao-Wen Dong et al. “MuseGAN: Multi-track Sequential Generative Adversarial Networks for Symbolic Music Generation and Accompaniment”. In: *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 32.1 (1 Apr. 25, 2018). ISSN: 2374-3468. DOI: 10.1609/aaai.v32i1.11312.
- [130] Chris Donahue, Julian McAuley, and Miller Puckette. *Adversarial Audio Synthesis*. Feb. 8, 2019. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.1802.04208. arXiv: 1802.04208 [cs]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1802.04208>. preprint.
- [131] Andrés Marafioti et al. “Adversarial Generation of Time-Frequency Features with Application in Audio Synthesis”. In: *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*. International Conference on Machine Learning. PMLR, May 24, 2019, pp. 4352–4362.
- [132] Gal Greshler, Tamar Shaham, and Tomer Michaeli. “Catch-A-Waveform: Learning to Generate Audio from a Single Short Example”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Vol. 34. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021, pp. 20916–20928.

- [133] Xudong Mao et al. *Least Squares Generative Adversarial Networks*. Apr. 5, 2017. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.1611.04076. arXiv: 1611.04076 [cs]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1611.04076>. preprint.
- [134] Santiago Pascual, Antonio Bonafonte, and Joan Serra. *SEGAN: Speech Enhancement Generative Adversarial Network*. June 9, 2017. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.1703.09452. arXiv: 1703.09452 [cs]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1703.09452>. preprint.
- [135] Ryuichi Yamamoto, Eunwoo Song, and Jae-Min Kim. *Probability Density Distillation with Generative Adversarial Networks for High-Quality Parallel Waveform Generation*. Aug. 27, 2019. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.1904.04472. arXiv: 1904.04472 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1904.04472>. preprint.
- [136] Jungil Kong, Jaehyeon Kim, and Jaekyoung Bae. “HiFi-GAN: Generative Adversarial Networks for Efficient and High Fidelity Speech Synthesis”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Vol. 33. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020, pp. 17022–17033.
- [137] Ryuichi Yamamoto, Eunwoo Song, and Jae-Min Kim. “Parallel WaveGAN: A Fast Waveform Generation Model Based on Generative Adversarial Networks with Multi-Resolution Spectrogram”. In: *ICASSP 2020 - 2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. ICASSP 2020 - 2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP). May 2020, pp. 6199–6203. DOI: 10.1109/ICASSP40776.2020.9053795.
- [138] Ji-Hoon Kim et al. *Fre-GAN: Adversarial Frequency-consistent Audio Synthesis*. June 14, 2021. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2106.02297. arXiv: 2106.02297 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2106.02297>. preprint.
- [139] Wangli Hao, Zhaoxiang Zhang, and He Guan. “CMCGAN: A Uniform Framework for Cross-Modal Visual-Audio Mutual Generation”. In: *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 32.1 (1 Apr. 27, 2018). ISSN: 2374-3468. DOI: 10.1609/aaai.v32i1.12329.
- [140] Jen-Yu Liu et al. “Unconditional Audio Generation with Generative Adversarial Networks and Cycle Regularization”. In: *Interspeech 2020*. Oct. 25, 2020, pp. 1997–2001. DOI: 10.21437/Interspeech.2020-1137. arXiv: 2005.08526 [cs, eess].
- [141] Kazi Nazmul Haque, Rajib Rana, and Björn W. Schuller. “High-Fidelity Audio Generation and Representation Learning With Guided Adversarial Autoencoder”. In: *IEEE Access* 8 (2020), pp. 223509–223528. ISSN: 2169-3536. DOI: 10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3040797.
- [142] Kazi Nazmul Haque et al. “Guided Generative Adversarial Neural Network for Representation Learning and Audio Generation Using Fewer Labelled Audio Data”. In: *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing* 29 (2021), pp. 2575–2590. ISSN: 2329-9304. DOI: 10.1109/TASLP.2021.3098764.
- [143] Marco Tagliasacchi et al. *SEANet: A Multi-modal Speech Enhancement Network*. Oct. 1, 2020. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2009.02095. arXiv: 2009.02095 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2009.02095>. preprint.
- [144] Jeff Donahue et al. *End-to-End Adversarial Text-to-Speech*. Mar. 17, 2021. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2006.03575. arXiv: 2006.03575 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2006.03575>. preprint.
- [145] Marco Pasini and Jan Schlüter. *Musika! Fast Infinite Waveform Music Generation*. Aug. 18, 2022. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2208.08706. arXiv: 2208.08706 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2208.08706>. preprint.
- [146] Jesse Engel et al. *GANsSynth: Adversarial Neural Audio Synthesis*. Apr. 14, 2019. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.1902.08710. arXiv: 1902.08710 [cs, eess, stat]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1902.08710>. preprint.
- [147] Mikolaj Binkowski et al. *High Fidelity Speech Synthesis with Adversarial Networks*. Sept. 26, 2019. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.1909.11646. arXiv: 1909.11646 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1909.11646>. preprint.
- [148] Peihao Chen et al. “Generating Visually Aligned Sound From Videos”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing* 29 (2020), pp. 8292–8302. ISSN: 1941-0042. DOI: 10.1109/TIP.2020.3009820.
- [149] Kun Su, Xiulong Liu, and Eli Shlizerman. “Audeo: Audio Generation for a Silent Performance Video”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Vol. 33. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020, pp. 3325–3337.
- [150] Geng Yang et al. “Multi-Band Melgan: Faster Waveform Generation For High-Quality Text-to-Speech”. In: *2021 IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop (SLT)*. 2021 IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop (SLT). Jan. 2021, pp. 492–498. DOI: 10.1109/SLT48900.2021.9383551.
- [151] Rongjie Huang et al. “Multi-Singer: Fast Multi-Singer Singing Voice Vocoder With A Large-Scale Corpus”. In: *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*. MM '21. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, Oct. 17, 2021, pp. 3945–3954. ISBN: 978-1-4503-8651-7. DOI: 10.1145/3474085.3475437.
- [152] Ivan Kobayev, Simon J. D. Prince, and Marcus A. Brubaker. “Normalizing Flows: An Introduction and Review of Current Methods”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 43.11 (Nov. 1, 2021), pp. 3964–3979. ISSN: 0162-8828, 2160-9292, 1939-3539. DOI: 10.1109/TPAMI.2020.2992934. arXiv: 1908.09257 [cs, stat].
- [153] Aaron Oord et al. “Parallel WaveNet: Fast High-Fidelity Speech Synthesis”. In: *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*. International Conference on Machine Learning. PMLR, July 3, 2018, pp. 3918–3926.
- [154] Wei Ping, Kainan Peng, and Jitong Chen. *ClariNet: Parallel Wave Generation in End-to-End Text-to-Speech*. Feb. 21, 2019. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.1807.07281. arXiv: 1807.07281 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1807.07281>. preprint.
- [155] Ryan Prenger, Rafael Valle, and Bryan Catanzaro. “Waveglow: A Flow-based Generative Network for Speech Synthesis”. In: *ICASSP 2019 - 2019 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. ICASSP 2019 - 2019 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP). May 2019, pp. 3617–3621. DOI: 10.1109/ICASSP2019.8683143.
- [156] Sungwon Kim et al. *FloWaveNet: A Generative Flow for Raw Audio*. May 20, 2019. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.1811.02155. arXiv: 1811.02155 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1811.02155>. preprint.
- [157] Jaehyeon Kim et al. “Glow-TTS: A Generative Flow for Text-to-Speech via Monotonic Alignment Search”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Vol. 33. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020, pp. 8067–8077.
- [158] Hyeongju Kim et al. *WaveNode: A Continuous Normalizing Flow for Speech Synthesis*. July 2, 2020. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2006.04598. arXiv: 2006.04598 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2006.04598>. preprint.
- [159] Wei Ping et al. “WaveFlow: A Compact Flow-based Model for Raw Audio”. In: *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*. International Conference on Machine Learning. PMLR, Nov. 21, 2020, pp. 7706–7716.
- [160] Hyun-Wook Yoon et al. *Audio Dequantization for High Fidelity Audio Generation in Flow-based Neural Vocoder*. Aug. 16, 2020. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2008.06867. arXiv: 2008.06867 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2008.06867>. preprint.
- [161] Aston Zhang et al. *Dive into Deep Learning*. Aug. 22, 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2106.11342. arXiv: 2106.11342 [cs]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2106.11342>. preprint.
- [162] Khalid Zaman et al. “A Survey of Audio Classification Using Deep Learning”. In: *IEEE Access* 11 (2023), pp. 106620–106649. ISSN: 2169-3536. DOI: 10.1109/ACCESS.2023.3318015.
- [163] Cheng-Zhi Anna Huang et al. *Music Transformer*. Dec. 12, 2018. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.1809.04281. arXiv: 1809.04281 [cs, eess, stat]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1809.04281>. preprint.
- [164] Curtis Hawthorne et al. *Enabling Factorized Piano Music Modeling and Generation with the MAESTRO Dataset*. Jan. 17, 2019. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.1810.12247. arXiv: 1810.12247 [cs, eess, stat]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1810.12247>. preprint.
- [165] Naihuan Li et al. “Neural Speech Synthesis with Transformer Network”. In: *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 33.01 (01 July 17, 2019), pp. 6706–6713. ISSN: 2374-3468. DOI: 10.1609/aaai.v33i01.33016706.
- [166] Naihuan Li et al. “RobuTrans: A Robust Transformer-Based Text-to-Speech Model”. In: *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 34.05 (05 Apr. 3, 2020), pp. 8228–8235. ISSN: 2374-3468. DOI: 10.1609/aaai.v34i05.6337.
- [167] Zhen Zeng et al. “AlignTTS: Efficient Feed-Forward Text-to-Speech System Without Explicit Alignment”. In: *ICASSP 2020 - 2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. ICASSP 2020 - 2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP). May 2020, pp. 6714–6718. DOI: 10.1109/ICASSP40776.2020.9054119.
- [168] Jeff Ens and Philippe Pasquier. *MMM : Exploring Conditional Multi-Track Music Generation with the Transformer*. Aug. 20, 2020. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2008.06048. arXiv: 2008.06048 [cs]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2008.06048>. preprint.
- [169] Dan Lim et al. *JDI-T: Jointly Trained Duration Informed Transformer for Text-To-Speech without Explicit Alignment*. Oct. 4, 2020. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2005.07799. arXiv: 2005.07799 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2005.07799>. preprint.
- [170] Mingjian Chen et al. *AdaSpeech: Adaptive Text to Speech for Custom Voice*. Mar. 1, 2021. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2103.00993. arXiv: 2103.00993 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2103.00993>. preprint.
- [171] Adrian Łańcucki. “Fastpitch: Parallel Text-to-Speech with Pitch Prediction”. In: *ICASSP 2021 - 2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. ICASSP 2021 - 2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP). June 2021, pp. 6588–6592. DOI: 10.1109/ICASSP39728.2021.9413889.
- [172] Shangzhe Di et al. “Video Background Music Generation with Controllable Music Transformer”. In: *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*. MM '21. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, Oct. 17, 2021, pp. 2037–2045. ISBN: 978-1-4503-8651-7. DOI: 10.1145/3474085.3475195.
- [173] Ann Lee et al. *Direct Speech-to-Speech Translation with Discrete Units*. Mar. 21, 2022. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2107.05604. arXiv: 2107.05604 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2107.05604>. preprint.
- [174] Weipeng Wang et al. “CPS: Full-Song and Style-Conditioned Music Generation with Linear Transformer”. In: *2022 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo Workshops (ICMEW)*. 2022 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo Workshops (ICMEW). July 2022, pp. 1–6. DOI: 10.1109/ICMEW56448.2022.9859286.
- [175] Xueyao Zhang et al. “Structure-Enhanced Pop Music Generation via Harmony-Aware Learning”. In: *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*. MM '22. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, Oct. 10, 2022, pp. 1204–1213. ISBN: 978-1-4503-9203-7. DOI: 10.1145/3503161.3548084.
- [176] Chunhui Bao and Qianru Sun. “Generating Music With Emotions”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia* 25 (2023), pp. 3602–3614. ISSN: 1941-0077. DOI: 10.1109/TMM.2022.3163543.
- [177] Eugene Kharitonov et al. *Speak, Read and Prompt: High-Fidelity Text-to-Speech with Minimal Supervision*. Feb. 7, 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2302.03540. arXiv: 2302.03540 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2302.03540>. preprint.
- [178] Felix Kreuk et al. *AudioGen: Textually Guided Audio Generation*. Mar. 5, 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2209.15352. arXiv: 2209.15352 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2209.15352>. preprint.
- [179] Tu Anh Nguyen et al. “Generative Spoken Dialogue Language Modeling”. In: *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 11 (Mar. 14, 2023), pp. 250–266. ISSN: 2307-387X. DOI: 10.1162/tacl_a_00545.
- [180] Peiling Lu et al. *MuseCoco: Generating Symbolic Music from Text*. May 31, 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2306.00110. arXiv: 2306.00110 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2306.00110>. preprint.
- [181] Paul K. Rubenstein et al. *AudioPaLM: A Large Language Model That Can Speak and Listen*. June 22, 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2306.12925. arXiv: 2306.12925 [cs, eess, stat]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2306.12925>. preprint.
- [182] Hugo Flores Garcia et al. *VampNet: Music Generation via Masked Acoustic Token Modeling*. July 12, 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2307.04686. arXiv: 2307.04686 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2307.04686>. preprint.
- [183] Zhichao Wang et al. *LM-VC: Zero-shot Voice Conversion via Speech Generation Based on Language Models*. Aug. 20, 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2306.10521. arXiv: 2306.10521 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2306.10521>. preprint.
- [184] Dongchao Yang et al. *UniAudio: An Audio Foundation Model Toward Universal Audio Generation*. Dec. 11, 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2310.00704. arXiv: 2310.00704 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2310.00704>. preprint.
- [185] Jade Copet et al. “Simple and Controllable Music Generation”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (Dec. 15, 2023), pp. 47704–47720.
- [186] Chris Donahue et al. *LakhNES: Improving Multi-Instrumental Music Generation with Cross-Domain Pre-Training*. July 10, 2019. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.1907.04868. arXiv: 1907.04868 [cs, eess, stat]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1907.04868>. preprint.
- [187] Yu-Siang Huang and Yi-Hsuan Yang. “Pop Music Transformer: Beat-based Modeling and Generation of Expressive Pop Piano Compositions”. In: *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*. MM '20. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, Oct. 12, 2020, pp. 1180–1188. ISBN: 978-1-4503-7988-5. DOI: 10.1145/3394171.3413671.
- [188] Zihang Dai et al. *Transformer-XL: Attentive Language Models Beyond a Fixed-Length Context*. June 2, 2019. arXiv: 1901.02860 [cs, stat]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1901.02860>. preprint.
- [189] Curtis Hawthorne et al. “General-Purpose, Long-Context Autoregressive Modeling with Perceiver AR”. In: *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*. International Conference on Machine Learning. PMLR, June 28, 2022, pp. 8535–8558.
- [190] Botao Yu et al. “Museformer: Transformer with Fine- and Coarse-Grained Attention for Music Generation”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (Dec. 6, 2022), pp. 1376–1388.
- [191] He Bai et al. “AS³ST: Alignment-Aware Acoustic and Text Pretraining for Speech Synthesis and Editing”. In: *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*. International Conference on Machine Learning. PMLR, June 28, 2022, pp. 1399–1411.

- [192] Anmol Gulati et al. *Conformer: Convolution-augmented Transformer for Speech Recognition*. May 16, 2020. arXiv: 2005.08100 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2005.08100>. preprint.
- [193] Yi-Chen Chen et al. *SpeechNet: A Universal Modularized Model for Speech Processing Tasks*. May 31, 2021. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2105.03070. arXiv: 2105.03070 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2105.03070>. preprint.
- [194] Sravya Popuri et al. *Enhanced Direct Speech-to-Speech Translation Using Self-supervised Pre-training and Data Augmentation*. Sept. 13, 2022. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2204.02967. arXiv: 2204.02967 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2204.02967>. preprint.
- [195] Haohe Liu et al. *AudioLDM: Text-to-Audio Generation with Latent Diffusion Models*. Sept. 9, 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2301.12503. arXiv: 2301.12503 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2301.12503>. preprint.
- [196] Nanxin Chen et al. *WaveGrad: Estimating Gradients for Waveform Generation*. Oct. 9, 2020. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2009.00713. arXiv: 2009.00713 [cs, eess, stat]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2009.00713>. preprint.
- [197] Zhifeng Kong et al. *DiffWave: A Versatile Diffusion Model for Audio Synthesis*. Mar. 30, 2021. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2009.09761. arXiv: 2009.09761 [cs, eess, stat]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2009.09761>. preprint.
- [198] Myeonghun Jeong et al. *Diff-TTS: A Denoising Diffusion Model for Text-to-Speech*. Apr. 3, 2021. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2104.01409. arXiv: 2104.01409 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2104.01409>. preprint.
- [199] Vadim Popov et al. "Grad-TTS: A Diffusion Probabilistic Model for Text-to-Speech". In: *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*. International Conference on Machine Learning. PMLR, July 1, 2021, pp. 8599–8608.
- [200] Yen-Ju Lu, Yu Tsao, and Shinji Watanabe. "A Study on Speech Enhancement Based on Diffusion Probabilistic Model". In: *2021 Asia-Pacific Signal and Information Processing Association Annual Summit and Conference (APSIPA ASC)*. 2021 Asia-Pacific Signal and Information Processing Association Annual Summit and Conference (APSIPA ASC). Dec. 2021, pp. 659–666.
- [201] Rongjie Huang et al. *FastDiff: A Fast Conditional Diffusion Model for High-Quality Speech Synthesis*. Apr. 21, 2022. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2204.09934. arXiv: 2204.09934 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2204.09934>. preprint.
- [202] Yen-Ju Lu et al. "Conditional Diffusion Probabilistic Model for Speech Enhancement". In: *ICASSP 2022 - 2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. ICASSP 2022 - 2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP). May 2022, pp. 7402–7406. DOI: 10.1109/ICASSP43922.2022.9746901.
- [203] Heeseung Kim, Sungwon Kim, and Sungroh Yoon. "Guided-TTS: A Diffusion Model for Text-to-Speech via Classifier Guidance". In: *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*. International Conference on Machine Learning. PMLR, June 28, 2022, pp. 11119–11133.
- [204] Sungwon Kim, Heeseung Kim, and Sungroh Yoon. *Guided-TTS 2: A Diffusion Model for High-quality Adaptive Text-to-Speech with Untranscribed Data*. May 30, 2022. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2205.15370. arXiv: 2205.15370 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2205.15370>. preprint.
- [205] Jinglin Liu et al. "DiffSinger: Singing Voice Synthesis via Shallow Diffusion Mechanism". In: *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 36.10 (10 June 28, 2022), pp. 11020–11028. ISSN: 2374-3468. DOI: 10.1609/aaai.v36i10.21350.
- [206] Joan Serra et al. *Universal Speech Enhancement with Score-based Diffusion*. Sept. 16, 2022. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2206.03065. arXiv: 2206.03065 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2206.03065>. preprint.
- [207] Qingqing Huang et al. *Noise2Music: Text-conditioned Music Generation with Diffusion Models*. Mar. 6, 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2302.03917. arXiv: 2302.03917 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2302.03917>. preprint.
- [208] Shentong Mo, Jing Shi, and Yapeng Tian. *DiffAVA: Personalized Text-to-Audio Generation with Visual Alignment*. May 22, 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2305.12903. arXiv: 2305.12903 [cs]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2305.12903>. preprint.
- [209] Max W. Y. Lam et al. *Efficient Neural Music Generation*. May 25, 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2305.15719. arXiv: 2305.15719 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2305.15719>. preprint.
- [210] Zhibin Qiu et al. "SRTNET: Time Domain Speech Enhancement via Stochastic Refinement". In: *ICASSP 2023 - 2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. ICASSP 2023 - 2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP). June 2023, pp. 1–5. DOI: 10.1109/ICASSP49357.2023.10095850.
- [211] Ke Chen et al. *MusicLDM: Enhancing Novelty in Text-to-Music Generation Using Beat-Synchronous Mixup Strategies*. Aug. 3, 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2308.01546. arXiv: 2308.01546 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2308.01546>. preprint.
- [212] Peike Li et al. *JEN-1: Text-Guided Universal Music Generation with Omnidirectional Diffusion Models*. Aug. 9, 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2308.04729. arXiv: 2308.04729 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2308.04729>. preprint.
- [213] Yatong Bai et al. *Accelerating Diffusion-Based Text-to-Audio Generation with Consistency Distillation*. Sept. 19, 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2309.10740. arXiv: 2309.10740 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2309.10740>. preprint.
- [214] Pengfei Zhu et al. *ERNIE-Music: Text-to-Waveform Music Generation with Diffusion Models*. Sept. 21, 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2302.04456. arXiv: 2302.04456 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2302.04456>. preprint.
- [215] Yi Yuan et al. *Retrieval-Augmented Text-to-Audio Generation*. Jan. 5, 2024. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2309.08051. arXiv: 2309.08051 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2309.08051>. preprint.
- [216] Curtis Hawthorne et al. *Multi-Instrument Music Synthesis with Spectrogram Diffusion*. Dec. 12, 2022. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2206.05408. arXiv: 2206.05408 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2206.05408>. preprint.
- [217] Minki Kang, Dongchan Min, and Sung Ju Hwang. "Grad-StyleSpeech: Any-Speaker Adaptive Text-to-Speech Synthesis with Diffusion Models". In: *ICASSP 2023 - 2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. ICASSP 2023 - 2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP). June 2023, pp. 1–5. DOI: 10.1109/ICASSP49357.2023.10095515.
- [218] Rongjie Huang et al. "Make-An-Audio: Text-To-Audio Generation with Prompt-Enhanced Diffusion Models". In: *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*. International Conference on Machine Learning. PMLR, July 3, 2023, pp. 13916–13932.
- [219] Haohe Liu et al. *AudioLDM 2: Learning Holistic Audio Generation with Self-supervised Pretraining*. Sept. 9, 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2308.05734. arXiv: 2308.05734 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2308.05734>. preprint.
- [220] Flavio Schneider et al. *Moⁿusai: Text-to-Music Generation with Long-Context Latent Diffusion*. Oct. 23, 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2301.11757. arXiv: 2301.11757 [cs, eess]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2301.11757>. preprint.
- [221] Soumi Maiti et al. "Speechlmscore: Evaluating Speech Generation Using Speech Language Model". In: *ICASSP 2023 - 2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. ICASSP 2023 - 2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP). June 2023, pp. 1–5. DOI: 10.1109/ICASSP49357.2023.10095710.
- [222] Sercan Ariik et al. "Neural Voice Cloning with a Few Samples". In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Vol. 31. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018.
- [223] Shawn Hershey et al. "CNN Architectures for Large-Scale Audio Classification". In: *2017 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. 2017 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP). Mar. 2017, pp. 131–135. DOI: 10.1109/ICASSP.2017.7952132.
- [224] Qiuqiang Kong et al. "PANNs: Large-Scale Pretrained Audio Neural Networks for Audio Pattern Recognition". In: *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing* 28 (2020), pp. 2880–2894. ISSN: 2329-9304. DOI: 10.1109/TASLP.2020.3030497.