

Spatial Voice Conversion: Voice Conversion Preserving Spatial Information and Non-target Signals

Kentaro Seki¹, Shinnosuke Takamichi^{1,2}, Norihiro Takamune¹, Yuki Saito¹, Kanami Imamura¹, Hiroshi Saruwatari¹

¹The University of Tokyo, Japan ²Keio University, Japan

seki-kentaro922@g.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Abstract

This paper proposes a new task called *spatial voice conversion*, which aims to convert a target voice while preserving spatial information and non-target signals. Traditional voice conversion methods focus on single-channel waveforms, ignoring the stereo listening experience inherent in human hearing. Our baseline approach addresses this gap by integrating blind source separation (BSS), voice conversion (VC), and spatial mixing to handle multi-channel waveforms. Through experimental evaluations, we organize and identify the key challenges inherent in this task, such as maintaining audio quality and accurately preserving spatial information. Our results highlight the fundamental difficulties in balancing these aspects, providing a benchmark for future research in spatial voice conversion. The proposed method’s code is publicly available to encourage further exploration in this domain.

Index Terms: voice conversion, speech extraction, blind source separation, augmented reality, virtual reality

1. Introduction

We humans possess the ability for auditory attention in speech communication, known as the *cocktail party effect* [1]. One contributing factor to this phenomenon is *spatial attention* [2, 3], the capability to focus on the voice coming from the desired direction among sounds heard with both ears. Another contributing factor is *informative attention*. For instance, if the voice is attractive to the listeners, we tend to listen more attentively [4]. Additionally, if the voice has an unfamiliar pronunciation, we interpret it as a voice with an understandable pronunciation to comprehend the spoken content [5]. It is important to note that *the ability is not about selection but attention*. In other words, for perceiving and comprehending the target speech, our ability involves processing the speech of unattended speakers as well [6, 7]. For example, even when paying attention to the pronunciation information of a speaker, one still understands the spatial location of that speaker and the information of other speakers without altering their spatial context.

Then, *is it possible to emulate this human ability with computers?* That is, we aim to develop a speech processing technology that transforms only the desired voice information while retaining all other content. If this can be achieved, it would enable communication augmentation that emphasizes human auditory attention more in the real world or in virtual reality (VR) spaces.

Related technologies include multi-channel audio source separation [8] and voice conversion [9]. Multi-channel audio source separation (upper right of Fig. 1) is a technology that spatially separates multiple audio sources, for example, used as source selection in the front-end of automatic speech recognition [10, 11]. On the other hand, voice conversion (lower left of




Figure 1: *Spatial voice conversion*. It converts target-speaker signal in multi-channel observations while unchanging spatial information and non-target signals.

Fig. 1) is a technology that converts targeted speech to another speech while retaining the spoken content, used for purposes such as converting foreign accents [12] or neutralize speech emotion [13]. By combining these two technologies, it is possible to convert only the targeted speech. That is, the targeted speech is spatially separated and extracted, then the extracted speech is converted. However, these technologies alone are insufficient to achieve the aforementioned goal. Because information other than the target speech must be retained, and the overall performance should be evaluated not only for the converted speech but also for the mixed speech with only the converted speech changed.

Therefore, this paper defines a new task called *spatial voice conversion* (lower right of Fig. 1) and organizes the challenges of this task through experiments using our proposed baseline method. In this task, only the speech of the target speaker in the multi-channel audio is converted, while retaining all other content (e.g., non-target speakers, spatial location). That is, the input is multi-channel audio, and the output is multi-channel audio with only the target speaker’s voice converted. The subject of evaluation is this multi-channel output audio. Our proposed baseline method consists of modules for blind source separation, voice conversion, and spatial mixing. Experiments demonstrate that this task involves fundamentally more challenging issues than simply combining modules. We publish the code of our method¹ as a baseline for future research on this task.

2. Related work

Multi-channel source separation. Array signal processing is a method that computationally implements spatial attention using microphone arrays. Unlike delay-and-sum beamformers [14],

¹https://github.com/sarulab-speech/spatial_voice_conversion.git

methods for achieving spatial attention without requiring assumptions about the statistical independence of signal sources have been proposed under the framework of blind source separation (BSS) [15, 16, 17]. Additionally, methods have been proposed that combine BSS with prior spatial information, which may contain errors [18, 19], such as geometrically constrained independent vector analysis (GC-IVA) [20]. Additionally, BSS can be used for speech enhancement by extracting only the targeted speech from multi-channel sources.

Voice conversion. Voice conversion (VC) is a task that involves transforming the paralinguistic and non-linguistic information of speech while preserving the linguistic content. Various approaches based on deep learning have been proposed, including diffusion models [21, 22]. Essentially, the VC task assumes that the input is a monaural signal containing only the targeted voice. If non-target audio (e.g., background noise) is included, it is often removed so that only the targeted voice is converted [23].

Preserving non-target information. Unlike BSS-based speech enhancement and VC, which remove non-target information, several methods have been proposed to reflect non-target information in the processed speech. In noisy-to-noisy VC [24], the background noise contained in the input speech is reflected in the converted speech. Another paper on speech enhancement [25] outputs stereo speech that not only emphasizes the target speech contained in stereo audio but also preserves its spatial information. These studies value the context in which the targeted speech occurs, taking the stance that information other than the targeted speech should be preserved, not removed. Our research also adopts this stance. The convergence of this direction demonstrates a growing interest in audio processing techniques that go beyond targeted speech alone.

3. Problem definition

3.1. Observation process

Let N be a natural number representing the number of speakers. We observe the speech signal of the target speaker for BSS (referred to as BSS-target speaker, same as VC-source speaker) $x_1(t)$ and signals from the remaining $N - 1$ sources (non-target signals), denoted as $x_2(t), \dots, x_N(t)$, using N microphones. Let $h_{ij}(t)$ represent the impulse response from the i -th sound source to the j -th microphone. The observed signal $y_j(t)$ at the j -th microphone is expressed as follows:

$$y_j(t) = h_{1j}(t) * x_1(t) + \sum_{i=2}^N h_{ij}(t) * x_i(t), \quad (1)$$

where $*$ denotes convolution. Note that $y_j(t)$ contains spatial information such as reverberation and direction of arrival (DoA), imparted by the convolution with $h_{ij}(t)$. We denote the vector obtained by stacking the observed signals vertically $[y_1(t), \dots, y_N(t)]^\top$ as $\mathbf{y}(t)$ as $\mathbf{y}(t)$ and its short-time Fourier transform (STFT) as $\mathbf{Y}(\omega, t)$.

To identify the target speaker, we assume that the steering vector $\mathbf{d}(\omega)$ towards the target speaker's direction is known. Ideally, the vector is equal to the transfer function from the target speaker to the microphones, but in reality, it may differ due to factors such as reflections and attenuation.

3.2. Our purpose

Our objective is to generate virtual observation signals $z_1(t), \dots, z_N(t)$ that transform the speaker identity of the BSS-target speaker while preserving spatial information and sounds coming from the other sources. Denoting voice conversion as




Figure 2: *Proposed method procedure: We record mixed audio from multiple speakers using multiple microphones, apply BSS to extract the voice of the BSS-target speaker (the same as the VC-source speaker), apply VC exclusively to this voice, and then output the remixed multi-channel signal.*

$\text{VC}[\cdot]$, $z_j(t)$ for each $j = 1, \dots, N$ is expressed as follows:

$$z_j(t) = h_{1j}(t) * \text{VC}[x_1(t)] + \sum_{i=2}^N h_{ij}(t) * x_i(t). \quad (2)$$

Through $\text{VC}[\cdot]$, $x_1(t)$ is transformed into the VC-target speaker.

4. Proposed method

A straightforward approach is to apply the VC model to each channel individually. However, applying VC to each channel separately results in inconsistent VC outputs across channels, failing to maintain the coherence of the multi-channel signal. Therefore, our proposed method applies VC to the monaural speech signal of the VC-source speaker. It consists of the processes of BSS, VC, and remixing, as shown in Fig. 2.

4.1. Blind source separation

We apply BSS to separate the mixed audio because we want to enhance the voice of the BSS-target speaker while also extracting the non-target signals. However, since completely blind separation cannot identify which signal corresponds to the BSS-target speaker, we utilize spatially regularized BSS (as mentioned in Section 2) to ensure that the voice of the target speaker for VC is output in the first channel.

The separated signals obtained with BSS are represented as $\mathbf{V}(\omega)\mathbf{Y}(\omega, t)$, where $\mathbf{V}(\omega)$ is an $N \times N$ separation matrix. Each component of this introduces a constant scaling factor for each frequency, resulting in signal distortion. To mitigate this distortion, we employ a technique known as projection back (PB) [26] and solve the following optimization problem:

$$\underset{\mathbf{W}(\omega)}{\text{minimize}} \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathbf{1}_N^\top \mathbf{W}(\omega) \mathbf{Y}(\omega, t) - Y_1(\omega, t) \right\|^2 \right], \quad (3)$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \exists k_1(\omega), \dots, k_N(\omega),$$

$$\mathbf{W}(\omega) = \text{diag}\{k_1(\omega), \dots, k_N(\omega)\} \mathbf{V}(\omega) \quad (4)$$

where $Y_1(\omega, t)$ denotes the first component of $\mathbf{Y}(\omega, t)$ and $\mathbf{1}_N$ represents an N -dimensional all-ones column vector. Finally, with a separation matrix $\mathbf{W}(\omega)$, we obtain the separation result as $\hat{\mathbf{X}}(\omega, t) = \mathbf{W}(\omega)\mathbf{Y}(\omega, t)$.

Please note that while PB mitigates distortion, it does not completely resolve the issue of scaling factors introduced during separation. As a result, the i -th component $\hat{X}_i(\omega, t)$ corresponds to the observed signal $h_{i1}(t) * x_1(t)$, rather than the original source signal $x_1(t)$. This issue becomes significant in the remixing process.

4.2. Voice conversion

We apply VC to the extracted speech signal $\hat{X}_1(\omega, t)$, which corresponds to the VC-source speaker. Although VC methods

that preserve noise and reverberation have been proposed, this study employs a VC model focused on producing clean monaural speech. The task of generating clean monaural audio has received widespread attention, resulting in a variety of available codes and pretrained models. Transforming $\hat{X}_1(\omega, t)$ to the VC-target speaker using VC, we denote the STFT of the output as $\text{VC}[\hat{X}_1(\omega, t)]$.

4.3. Remixing

We impart spatial information to VC output $\text{VC}[\hat{X}_1(\omega, t)]$ and non-target signals $\hat{X}_{2:N}(\omega) := [\hat{X}_2(\omega, t), \dots, \hat{X}_N(\omega, t)]^\top$, obtaining desired multi-channel signal.

Since remixing is the reverse process of separation, a straightforward approach is to apply the inverse matrix of the separation matrix, denoted as $\hat{A}(\omega) := \mathbf{W}(\omega)^{-1}$. In fact, the (i, j) element $\hat{A}_{ij}(\omega)$ represents the relative transfer function from the i -th microphone to the j -th microphone for the i -th sound source, so by applying it to $\hat{X}_{2:N}(\omega)$, spatial information can be reproduced. This approach output the following signal:

$$\hat{\mathbf{Z}}(\omega, t) = \hat{A}(\omega) \begin{bmatrix} \text{VC}[\hat{X}_1(\omega, t)] \\ \hat{X}_{2:N}(\omega, t) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5)$$

However, this method is inappropriate for $\text{VC}[\hat{X}_1(\omega, t)]$. The relative transfer function includes the inverse filter of the transfer process from the speaker to the i -th microphone. Unlike $\hat{X}_{2:N}(\omega)$, which is affected by the transfer function $h_{i,1}(t)$, $\text{VC}[\hat{X}_1(\omega, t)]$ is clean signal. Applying $\hat{A}(\omega)$ introduce significant distortion due to the instability of the inverse filter. Therefore, for $\text{VC}[\hat{X}_1(\omega, t)]$, an alternative method is required to reproduce the spatial information.

Another method to explicitly reproduce the DoA using the steering vector $\mathbf{d}(\omega)$ can be considered. The steering vector $\mathbf{d}(\omega)$ models the direct path and calculates the transfer function from the VC-source speaker to the i -th microphone. Although this method cannot reproduce the reverberation, it is expected that reproducing the DoA will sufficiently capture the essential spatial information. Denoting the i -th column of $\hat{A}(\omega)$ as $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i(\omega)$ and defining $\hat{A}_{2:N}(\omega) := [\hat{\mathbf{a}}_2(\omega), \dots, \hat{\mathbf{a}}_N(\omega)]$, the output signal can be expressed by the following equation:

$$\hat{\mathbf{Z}}(\omega, t) = [\mathbf{d}(\omega) \quad \hat{A}_{2:N}(\omega)] \begin{bmatrix} \text{VC}[\hat{X}_1(\omega, t)] \\ \hat{X}_{2:N}(\omega, t) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

5. Discussion

This section lists the problems in the our proposed method.

Robustness of voice conversion. The input to the VC is degraded due to being the distant speaker’s voice and the noise introduced by separation errors. Therefore, the VC model needs to be robust. Since our method utilizes a monaural VC model, we can address this issue by benefiting from the robustness of modern VC models [27, 28] designed to operate effectively in real-world scenarios with monaural audio.

Target speaker tracking. Since the input to spatial VC contains multiple signals, it is necessary to identify which one is the VC-source speaker. Our method addresses this by assuming the spatial relationship between the microphones and the speaker. Another approach is to use speaker identification, which allows tracking without relying on spatial information.

Impact on signal contamination. Let us consider a case that the voices of each speaker are not sufficiently separated and the voice of one speaker slightly mixes with another’s. The effect of non-target signals contaminating $\hat{X}_1(\omega, t)$ can be ad-




Figure 3: Configurations of speakers and microphones, where “x” and “o” denote speakers and microphones, respectively.

ressed by using noise-robust VC, as discussed above. The separation error between non-target signals has ultimately no impact because it is absorbed in the subsequent remixing stage. If the voice of the VC-source speaker is mixed into the output of the non-target signals $\hat{X}_{2:N}(\omega, t)$, the final output will contain both the VC-source speaker and the VC-target speaker. Since these two voices are speaking the same content simultaneously, it is expected that if the contaminating component is sufficiently small, it will be masked and not perceived.

Balancing audio quality and spatial information in remixing. As discussed in Section 4.3, the remixing approach using the separation matrix (Eq. 5) leads to quality degradation. This issue arises from the constant scaling factor of BSS explained in Section 4.1 and is an inherent challenge regardless of the specific BSS method used. On the other hand, in practical settings, the method utilizing the steering vector (Eq. 6) faces challenges in capturing spatial information accurately due to modeling errors caused by reverberation and scattering. Therefore, reproducing spatial information without degrading quality proves to be a challenging task.

6. Experimental evaluations

We conducted experimental evaluations to identify challenges in achieving spatial VC.

6.1. Data and settings

To generate simulation data, we utilized speech data from a nonparallel30 subset of the JVS corpus [29], specifically from jvs001 to jvs010, 10 speakers (5 males and 5 females). The observed signals were generated by simulating two-channel recordings of two speakers using pyroomacoustics [30], representing the left and right channels. The speakers consist of the BSS-target and non-target speakers, corresponding to $x_1(t)$ and $x_2(t)$, respectively. They were chosen to be speakers of different genders, allowing listeners to identify the target speaker more effectively. Utterance durations of the two speakers were overlapped by 50%, reflecting the infrequent occurrence of complete overlap in real conversations. The positions of the speakers and microphones are shown in Fig. 3. The interval of the microphones was set at 15 cm. The room size is $9 \text{ m} \times 7.5 \text{ m} \times 3.5 \text{ m}$. The reflection coefficient r was set to 0.5, and the reverberation time (RT_{60}) was approximately 200 ms.

All the speech signals were sampled at 24 kHz. The STFT was computed using a Hann window whose length was set at 4096 samples, and the window shift was 2048 samples. The steering vector $\mathbf{d}(\omega)$ used in our proposed method was calculated under the far-field assumption based on the angle θ from the center of the microphone array to the target speaker’s position. For BSS, we employed GC-IVA [20], augmenting the evaluation function with a null constraint using the steering vector $\mathbf{d}(\omega)$ with a variable weight λ . The minimization process was carried out using the auxiliary function-based method [17], it-

Table 1: MOS on naturalness of VC-target speaker’s speech with each method and SD of MOS. A higher value indicates better audio quality (\uparrow).

Methods	Stereo	Monaural-Left (PB target)	Monaural-Right
Ideal	4.254 \pm 0.060	4.062 \pm 0.060	4.102 \pm 0.058
Inverse	1.992 \pm 0.064	4.142 \pm 0.060	1.388 \pm 0.042
Steering	3.405 \pm 0.062	3.975 \pm 0.066	3.132 \pm 0.070

erating 50 times with $\lambda = 1$, followed by 50 iterations with $\lambda = 0$. The VC model was implemented using the publicly available code of DDSP-SVC [31] version 5.0, and it was trained for 100k steps on the parallel100 subset from the JVS corpus [29]. The VC-target speakers were randomly selected from jvs001 to jvs010, ensuring they are speakers of the same gender as the VC-source speakers. We chose the left channel as the PB-target channel.

To verify the issues discussed in Section 5, we evaluated the following three methods:

- “Inverse”: We performed spatial voice conversion using the proposed method, and the remixing was carried out as the inverse process of separation, as outlined in Eq. 5. Utilizing BSS for estimating spatial information allows for the consideration of factors such as DoA and reverberation. However, this method may compromise acoustic quality due to issues with the inverse filters, as discussed in Section 4.3.
- “Steering”: We performed spatial voice conversion using the proposed method, and remixing was conducted using the steering vector, as outlined in Eq. 6. This method ignores reverberation, a significant factor in real-world scenarios, so the reproducibility of spatial information may decrease. However, it is expected to maintain audio quality, unlike “Inverse”.
- “Ideal”: As a reference for comparison, we obtained the desired audio as indicated in Eq. 2. In this method, VC takes an ideal recorded speech instead of BSS output, and spatial information is added through simulation.

To assess the quality of the output audio and the accuracy of spatial information reproduction, we conducted subjective evaluations for naturalness and objective evaluations using the spatial correlation matrix (SCM). A total of 100 listeners rated the naturalness of the VC-target speaker’s voice on a five-point scale. Each listener assessed 20 samples, preceded by 6 dummy samples to calibrate range equalization bias [32]. Then, we calculated mean opinion score (MOS) for each method. In addition to evaluating stereo audio, assessments for monaural channels (left and right) were conducted to investigate which channel contributes to quality degradation. For objective evaluation, we computed the log-determinant divergence (LDD) [33] of SCM from “Ideal” to both “Inverse” and “Steering” as LDD of SCM serves as a metric to represent the estimation error in spatial information [34]. To mitigate the impact of outliers, we extracted data from the first quartile to the third quartile and calculated the mean and standard deviation (SD).

6.2. Results

6.2.1. Acoustic quality

Table 1 presents MOSs on naturalness. In the stereo results, “Inverse” exhibited a significantly lower score compared to “Steering,” indicating that the remixing process in “Inverse” caused a noticeable degradation in audio quality.

Table 2: LDD of SCM from “Ideal” to each method and its SD in each reflection coefficient r . A lower value indicates a more accurate reproduction of spatial information (\downarrow).

Methods	$r = 0.2$	$r = 0.5$	$r = 0.8$
Inverse	0.468 \pm 0.074	0.979 \pm 0.147	2.058 \pm 0.270
Steering	1.990 \pm 0.367	3.097 \pm 0.552	4.666 \pm 0.535

Comparing the monaural-left results, which are the target channel for PB, “Inverse” achieved naturalness comparable to the other methods. Achieving a high score comparable to “Ideal” suggests that the degradation of VC input does not negatively impact the quality of VC output. This is due to the robustness of VC, as discussed in Section 5. In contrast, in the monaural-right channel, “Inverse” yielded notably lower results. This outcome highlights that the relative transfer functions in this method degrade audio quality significantly as discussed in Section 4.3. Therefore, from an audio quality perspective, “Steering” should be employed.

6.2.2. Spatial information

Table 2 presents the LDD values. In addition to the condition used for naturalness evaluation ($r = 0.5$), we conducted assessments with different reflection coefficient (r). Specifically, $r = 0.2$ and $r = 0.8$ correspond to RT_{60} values of approximately 70 ms and 400 ms, respectively.

Comparing different reverberation times, the LDD of both methods deteriorated as the reverberation time increased. This decline is attributed to the growing challenge of BSS with longer reverberation times, resulting in a decrease in the accuracy of spatial information estimated by BSS.

Furthermore, across all reverberation time settings, “Inverse” outperformed “Steering,” and this difference widens with the longer reverberation time. This difference is attributed to the flexibility in spatial information estimation of “Inverse,” while “Steering” relies on a predetermined and limited model. In other words, “Steering” is a method where the estimation accuracy of spatial information decreases when external factors come into play, indicating that it is sensitive to unaccounted factors. In practical settings, where reverberation is an important factor for spatial information, “Steering” may particularly struggle with spatial information reproduction, amplifying errors in the steering vector. Therefore, the results suggest that “Inverse” should be favored from a spatial information perspective. However, this contradicts the conclusion from the audio quality perspective.

7. Conclusion

We proposed a novel task called spatial voice conversion. This task extends voice conversion (VC) from single-channel signals to multi-channel signals, aiming to perform VC while preserving spatial information and non-target signals. In this paper, we integrate existing blind source separation (BSS) methods with VC models to address this task, highlighting the challenges posed by remixing. In our discussion, we organized the challenges of this task. Although the experimental conditions were limited, we found that balancing audio quality and spatial information reproduction presents a fundamental difficulty. Therefore, a crucial question arises for future work: *Is it possible to achieve spatial voice conversion that balances both audio quality and spatial information reproduction?*

8. Acknowledgements

This work is supported by Research Grant S of the Tateishi Science and Technology Foundation.

9. References

- [1] E. C. Cherry, "Some experiments on the recognition of speech, with one and with two ears," *The Journal of the acoustical society of America*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 975–979, 1953.
- [2] J. Blauert, *Spatial hearing: the psychophysics of human sound localization*. MIT press, 1997.
- [3] M. Ebata, "Spatial unmasking and attention related to the cocktail party problem," *Acoustical Science and Technology*, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 208–219, 2003.
- [4] A. Chattopadhyay, D. W. Dahl, R. J. Ritchie, and K. N. Shahin, "Hearing voices: The impact of announcer speech characteristics on consumer response to broadcast advertising," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 198–204, 2003.
- [5] Y. V. Melguy and K. Johnson, "General adaptation to accented English: Speech intelligibility unaffected by perceived source of non-native accent," *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, vol. 149, no. 4, pp. 2602–2614, 04 2021.
- [6] J. L. Lewis, "Semantic processing of unattended messages using dichotic listening," *Journal of experimental psychology*, vol. 85, no. 2, p. 225, 1970.
- [7] S. Bentin, M. Kutas, and S. A. Hillyard, "Semantic processing and memory for attended and unattended words in dichotic listening: behavioral and electrophysiological evidence," *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, vol. 21, no. 1, p. 54, 1995.
- [8] S. Makino, *Audio source separation*. Springer, 2018, vol. 433.
- [9] B. Sisman, J. Yamagishi, S. King, and H. Li, "An overview of voice conversion and its challenges: From statistical modeling to deep learning," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 29, pp. 132–157, 2020.
- [10] T. N. Sainath, R. J. Weiss, K. W. Wilson, B. Li, A. Narayanan, E. Variiani, M. Bacchiani, I. Shafran, A. Senior, K. Chin *et al.*, "Multichannel signal processing with deep neural networks for automatic speech recognition," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 965–979, 2017.
- [11] Y. Masuyama, X. Chang, W. Zhang, S. Cornell, Z.-Q. Wang, N. Ono, Y. Qian, and S. Watanabe, "Exploring the integration of speech separation and recognition with self-supervised learning representation," in *2023 IEEE Workshop on Applications of Signal Processing to Audio and Acoustics (WASPAA)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–5.
- [12] S. Aryal and R. Gutierrez-Osuna, "Can voice conversion be used to reduce non-native accents?" in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2014, pp. 7879–7883.
- [13] K. Zhou, B. Sisman, R. Liu, and H. Li, "Emotional voice conversion: Theory, databases and esd," *Speech Communication*, vol. 137, pp. 1–18, 2022.
- [14] B. D. Van Veen and K. M. Buckley, "Beamforming: A versatile approach to spatial filtering," *IEEE assp magazine*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 4–24, 1988.
- [15] T. Kim, T. Eltoft, and T.-W. Lee, "Independent vector analysis: An extension of ica to multivariate components," in *International conference on independent component analysis and signal separation*. Springer, 2006, pp. 165–172.
- [16] A. Hiroe, "Solution of permutation problem in frequency domain ica, using multivariate probability density functions," in *Independent Component Analysis and Blind Signal Separation: 6th International Conference, ICA 2006, Charleston, SC, USA, March 5-8, 2006. Proceedings 6*. Springer, 2006, pp. 601–608.
- [17] N. Ono, "Stable and fast update rules for independent vector analysis based on auxiliary function technique," in *2011 IEEE Workshop on Applications of Signal Processing to Audio and Acoustics (WASPAA)*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 189–192.
- [18] L. C. Parra and C. V. Alvino, "Geometric source separation: Merging convolutive source separation with geometric beamforming," *IEEE Transactions on Speech and Audio Processing*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 352–362, 2002.
- [19] M. Knaak, S. Araki, and S. Makino, "Geometrically constrained independent component analysis," *IEEE transactions on audio, speech, and language processing*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 715–726, 2007.
- [20] L. Li and K. Koishida, "Geometrically constrained independent vector analysis for directional speech enhancement," in *Proc. ICASSP*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 846–850.
- [21] S. Liu, Y. Cao, D. Su, and H. Meng, "Diffsvc: A diffusion probabilistic model for singing voice conversion," in *2021 IEEE Automatic Speech Recognition and Understanding Workshop (ASRU)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 741–748.
- [22] V. Popov, I. Vovk, V. Gogoryan, T. Sadekova, M. S. Kudinov, and J. Wei, "Diffusion-based voice conversion with fast maximum likelihood sampling scheme," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=8c50f-DoWAu>
- [23] C. Valentini-Botinhao, X. Wang, S. Takaki, and J. Yamagishi, "Investigating rnn-based speech enhancement methods for noise-robust text-to-speech," in *SSW*, 2016, pp. 146–152.
- [24] C. Xie, Y.-C. Wu, P. L. Tobing, W.-C. Huang, and T. Toda, "Noisy-to-noisy voice conversion framework with denoising model," in *2021 Asia-Pacific Signal and Information Processing Association Annual Summit and Conference (APSIPA ASC)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 814–820.
- [25] M. Togami, J.-M. Valin, K. Helwani, R. Giri, U. Isik, and M. M. Goodwin, "Real-time stereo speech enhancement with spatial-cue preservation based on dual-path structure," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.00337*, 2024.
- [26] N. Murata, S. Ikeda, and A. Ziehe, "An approach to blind source separation based on temporal structure of speech signals," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 41, no. 1-4, pp. 1–24, 2001.
- [27] C.-Y. Huang, K.-W. Chang, and H.-Y. Lee, "Toward degradation-robust voice conversion," in *Proc. ICASSP*, Singapore, May 2022, pp. 6777–6781.
- [28] T. Igarashi, Y. Saito, K. Seki, S. Takamichi, R. Yamamoto, K. Tachibana, and H. Saruwatari, "Noise-robust voice conversion by conditional denoising training using latent variables of recording quality and environment," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.07280*, 2024.
- [29] S. Takamichi, K. Mitsui, Y. Saito, T. Koriyama, N. Tanji, and H. Saruwatari, "Jvs corpus: free japanese multi-speaker voice corpus," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.06248*, 2019.
- [30] R. Scheibler, E. Bezzam, and I. Dokmanić, "Pyroomacoustics: A python package for audio room simulation and array processing algorithms," in *Proc. ICASSP*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 351–355.
- [31] "DDSP-SVC," <https://github.com/yxlllc/DDSP-SVC>.
- [32] E. Cooper and J. Yamagishi, "Investigating Range-Equalizing Bias in Mean Opinion Score Ratings of Synthesized Speech," in *Proc. INTERSPEECH 2023*, 2023, pp. 1104–1108.
- [33] B. Kulis, M. A. Sustik, and I. S. Dhillon, "Low-rank kernel learning with bregman matrix divergences," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 10, no. 2, 2009.
- [34] Y. Kubo, N. Takamune, D. Kitamura, and H. Saruwatari, "Blind speech extraction based on rank-constrained spatial covariance matrix estimation with multivariate generalized gaussian distribution," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 28, pp. 1948–1963, 2020.