

Environment Sound Classification using Multiple Feature Channels and Attention based Deep Convolutional Neural Network

Jivitesh Sharma*, Ole-Christoffer Granmo[†] and Morten Goodwin[‡]

Centre for Artificial Intelligence Research

Department of Information and Communication Technology

University of Agder, Norway

*jivitesh.sharma@uia.no, [†]ole.granmo@uia.no, [‡]morten.goodwin@uia.no

Abstract—In this paper, we propose a model for the Environment Sound Classification Task (ESC) that consists of multiple feature channels given as input to a Deep Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) with Attention mechanism. The novelty of the paper lies in using multiple feature channels consisting of Mel-Frequency Cepstral Coefficients (MFCC), Gammatone Frequency Cepstral Coefficients (GFCC), the Constant Q-transform (CQT) and Chromagram. Such multiple features have never been used before for signal or audio processing. And, we employ a deeper CNN (DCNN) compared to previous models, consisting of spatially separable convolutions working on time and feature domain separately. Alongside, we use attention modules that perform channel and spatial attention together. We use some data augmentation techniques to further boost performance. Our model is able to achieve state-of-the-art performance on all three benchmark environment sound classification datasets, i.e. the UrbanSound8K (97.52%), ESC-10 (95.75%) and ESC-50 (88.50%). To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time that a single environment sound classification model is able to achieve state-of-the-art results on all three datasets. For ESC-10 and ESC-50 datasets, the accuracy achieved by the proposed model is beyond human accuracy of 95.7% and 81.3% respectively.

Index Terms—Deep Convolutional Neural Networks, Attention, Multiple Feature Channels, Environment Sound Classification, Mel-Frequency Cepstral Coefficients, Constant Q-transform, Gammatone Frequency Cepstral Coefficients, Chromagram, ESC-50, ESC-10, UrbanSound8K

I. INTRODUCTION

THERE are many important applications related to speech and audio processing. One of the most important application is the Environment Sound Classification (ESC) that deals with distinguishing between sounds from the real environment. It is a complex task that involves classifying a sound event into an appropriate class such as siren, dog barking, airplane, people talking etc. This task is quite different compared to Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR) [1], since environment sound features differ drastically from speech sounds. In ASR, speech is converted to text. However, in ESC, there is no such thing as speech, just sounds. So, ESC models are quite different compared to ASR models.

ASR models typically consist of hybrid Deep Neural Network-Hidden Markov Model (DNN-HMM) [2] or more recently, end-to-end Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs) encoder-decoder structure [3], sometimes with attention mechanism [4], [5] and coupled with Convolutional Neural Networks

(CNNs) for feature extraction [6]. On the other hand, there are enormous number of possibilities to build ESC models using different audio feature extraction techniques and machine learning or non-machine learning based classification models. The most successful ESC models consist of one or more standard audio feature extraction techniques and deep neural networks. In this paper, we explore the idea of employing multiple feature extraction techniques like the Mel-frequency Cepstral Coefficients (MFCC) [7], Gammatone Frequency Cepstral Coefficients (GFCC) [8], Constant Q-Transform (CQT) [9], Chromagram [10] and stack them to create a multiple channel input to our classifier.

After feature extraction, the next stage is classification. Many machine learning algorithms have been used to classify sound, music or audio events such as the Decision Tree classifier [11], Random Forest [12], Support Vector Machine [13]–[15], Extreme Learning Machine [16], [17] etc. However, in the ESC task, Deep CNNs have been able to outperform all other classification techniques, as evident from the previous state-of-the-art models. They have been used by many researchers to achieve high classification performance [18]–[26]. In this paper, we also employ a Deep CNN for classification. However, we split between time and frequency domain feature processing by using separable convolutions [27] with different kernel sizes. Also, we use max pooling across only one of the domains at a time, until after the last set of convolutional layers to combine time and frequency domain features. This enables processing time and frequency domain features separately and then combining them at a later stage. We also employ 1×1 convolutions to increase the number of learnable parameters (as an additional layer/set of weights).

Along with the model, we also design a novel attention module that enables both spatial and channel attention. In order to achieve both spatial and channel attention with the same module, we need an attention weight matrix with dimensions equal to the DCNN block output. So that, each output feature map in each channel has its own attention weights. We use the depthwise separable convolution [28] to output an $n \times m \times c$ attention weight matrix. This enables spatial and channel attention to be achieved with a very small increase in number of parameters and computational operations.

Using these techniques allows our model to achieve state-of-the-art performance on all three benchmark datasets for

environment sound classification task, namely, ESC-10, ESC-50 [29] and UrbanSound8K [30]. The rest of the paper has been organized in the following manner: Section 2 briefly enlists previous research done on the ESC task using Deep CNNs and other previous state-of-the-art methods. Section 3 details our proposed ESC model consisting of multiple feature channels, the Deep CNN classifier and the Attention module. Section 4 explains our experimental setup and implementation details and also displays our final results on the datasets. Finally, section 5 concludes our work.

II. RELATED WORK

There have been several innovative and high performance approaches proposed for the task of environmental sound classification (ESC). Here, we focus on deep learning based and state-of-the-art methods on the ESC-10, ESC-50 and UrbanSound8K benchmark datasets.

There have been many different deep learning and neural network based techniques used for the ESC task. One of the most popular methods that are at the core of the highest performing models for not only ESC but also for ASR are the Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) [31]. In [23], a deep CNN was shown to give competitive results for the ESC tasks by thorough and exhaustive experimentation on the three benchmark datasets.

In [32], phase encoded filterbank energies (PEFBEs) was proposed as a novel feature extraction technique. It was shown that it outperformed vanilla filterbank energies (FBEs). Finally, a score-level fusion of FBEs and PEFBEs with a CNN classifier achieved best performance. So, it was shown experimentally that PEFBEs posses complementary features to FBEs.

Another novel aggregation of feature extraction techniques was proposed in [33]. It was shown that aggregating multiple features with complementary behaviour along with a CNN outperformed models that consisted of Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM) classifier. The Teager Energy Operator (TEO) was used to modify the Gammatone cepstral coefficients to produce TEO-GTSC. TEO is able to track the energy changes in an audio signal very accurately. The best results were produced when Gammatone cepstral coefficients were combined TEO-GTSC with score-level fusion.

A multi-temporal resolution CNN was proposed in [34]. Here, multiple CNNs with different filter sizes and stride lengths work on a raw audio signal on different temporal resolutions, in parallel. This hierarchy of features is combined by direct connections between convolutional layers which has better information flow (somewhat similar to DenseNets [35]).

An end-to-end approach based on feature extraction and classification of raw audio signals by CNNs was proposed in [18]. The model, called EnvNet, was able to achieve competitive performance on all three benchmark datasets. In the second version of the EnvNet, called EnvNetv2 [22], the authors employed a mechanism called Between Class (BC) learning. In BC learning, two audio signals from different classes are mixed with each other with a random ratio. The CNN model is then fed the mixed sound as input and trained to output

this mixing ratio. BC learning was also shown to boost the performance of other ESC models as well.

Another approach based on 1D-CNNs working on raw audio signals is proposed in [21]. A 1D-CNN is used to classify environmental sounds on variable length raw audio waveforms. They show that no feature extraction is needed since the first layer of the 1D-CNN can be initialized as a Gammatone filter bank. Initializing the convolution kernels of the first layer by 64 band pass gammatone filters, the raw input signal is decomposed into 64 frequency bands. This approach that works on raw audio signals achieves 89% accuracy on the UrbanSound8K dataset.

In [25], a pure convolutional approach to ESC was proposed. The model proposed in [25] consisted of a very deep fully convolutional neural network with a maximum of 34 layers. The network was carefully designed with batch normalization layers and residual learning. Their 18 layer model gave the best performance which matched the performance of models that used log-mel features.

A very innovative and effective unsupervised approach of learning a filterbank from raw audio signals was proposed in [36]. Convolutional Restricted Boltzmann Machine (ConvRBM), which is an unsupervised generative model, was trained to raw audio waveforms. The authors show that the sub-band filters in the mid-frequency range resemble Fourier basis while in the low-frequency range resemble gammatone basis. A CNN is used as a classifier along with ConvRBM filterbank and score-level fusion with Mel filterbank energies. Their model achieves 86.5% on the ESC-50 dataset which was the state-of-the-art which we beat in this paper.

Another innovative approach of using visual knowledge transfer learning for sound recognition was proposed in [37]. The model, called SoundNet, leveraged the large collection of unlabelled videos (with audio) to transfer discriminative visual information to boost environment sound classification. The visual information of the unlabelled videos was given as input to visual recognition networks and the raw audio waveforms from those videos were fed to the SoundNet. The model was trained to minimize the Kullback-Leibler divergence between the outputs of the SoundNet and the visual recognition network to transfer the visual information to the SoundNet. Finally, ignoring the output layer of the SoundNet, the model is used as feature extraction to train an SVM classifier.

In [20], the scarcity of data for training a Deep CNN was addressed by data augmentation techniques for audio signals. Data augmentation methods such as time stretching, pitch shifting, dynamic range compression and adding noise were used and thoroughly analysed with experiments on the UrbanSound8K dataset. It was also shown that results can be further improved by class-conditional data augmentation. We use some of the augmentation techniques proposed in [20].

A novel data augmentation technique for audio was proposed in [19]. The method called Mixup is used to generate new training data for the CNN model. It consists of mixing two audio signals and their labels, in a linear interpolation manner, where the mixing is controlled by a factor λ . Time Stretch and Pitch Shift are also used for augmentation. Log-mel spectrograms and gammatone spectrograms are used as audio

features as input to the Deep CNN model. In this way, their model achieves 83.7% accuracy on the UrbanSound8K dataset and competitive performance on the ESC-10 and ESC-50 datasets.

Some well known State-of-the-art Deep CNNs such as AlexNet [38] and GoogleNet [39] were used for ESC in [40]. Features such as MFCC, Spectrogram and CRP of audio signals were extracted and treated as image representations which were then fed to the Deep CNNs. Both AlexNet and GoogleNet were able to obtain decent classification accuracies on benchmark ESC datasets.

A complex two stream structure deep CNN model was proposed in [26]. It consists of two CNN streams which are combined with decision-level fusion at the end. One is the LMCNet which works on the log-mel spectrogram, chroma, spectral contrast and tonnetz features of audio signals and the other is the MCNet which takes MFCC, chroma, spectral contrast and tonnetz features as inputs. The decisions of the two CNNs are fused using the Dempster-Shafer evidence theory to get the final TSDCNN-DS model. It achieves 97.2% accuracy on the UrbanSound8K dataset, which was the state-of-the-art on that dataset, which we beat in this paper.

There have also been a few contributions towards the ESC task that consisted of attention based systems. In [41], a combination of two attention mechanisms, channel and temporal, was proposed. The temporal attention consists of 1×1 convolution for feature aggregation followed by a small CNN to produce temporal attention weights. On the other hand, channel attention consists of a bank of fully connected layers to produce the channel attention map. Using two separate attention models makes the system very complex and increases the number of parameters by a lot. We perform spatial and channel attention with just one depthwise convolutional layer (a 1×1 conv. is also added to adjust the number of channels). A multi-stream network with temporal attention for the ESC task was proposed in [42]. The model consists of three streams with each stream receiving one of the three stacked inputs: raw waveform, STFT (Short-time Fourier Transform) and delta STFT. A temporal attention model received the inputs directly and propagated its output to the main models intermediate layers. Here, again, the model is too complex and also, the attention block doesn't receive any intermediate feedback from the main model.

These exemplary research works mentioned above provide us with many insights by achieving high performance on difficult datasets. But, they also suffer from issues regarding feature extraction, computational complexity and CNN model architecture. In this paper, we try to address these issues and in doing so, achieve state-of-the-art performance. In the next section, we explain our model in detail.

III. PROPOSED ENVIRONMENT SOUND CLASSIFICATION MODEL

We propose a novel ESC model that consists of multiple feature channels extracted from the audio signal and a new DCNN architecture consisting of separable convolutions, that works on time and frequency domain separately and a depthwise convolution based attention mechanism.

Usually, one or two feature extraction techniques along with some statistical information is used as the feature set. However, just a couple of feature extraction methods aren't able to obtain a majority of distinguishable features for all categories of environment sounds.

We address this issue by employing multiple feature extraction techniques and stacking their outputs like channels in an image to make them suitable for DCNN. The feature extraction stage consists of four channels of features, which are: Mel-Frequency Cepstral Coefficients (MFCC), Gammatone Frequency Cepstral Coefficients (GFCC), Constant Q-transform (CQT) and Chromagram.

For the classification stage, we propose a CNN architecture that works better for audio data, as shown in Fig. 3. We use spatially separable convolutions to process time and frequency domain features separately and aggregate them at the end. Also, the downsampling value is different for time and frequency domains in the maxpooling layers. Along side the main DCNN model, we add spatial and channel attention using the depthwise convolution. The attention module is attached to every block of the main model. It takes the output of the previous layer as its input and returns an attention weight matrix, which is then applied to the output of the current main block. In the subsequent sub-sections, we explain the feature extraction and classification stages of our model.

A. Multiple Feature Channels

Some papers have advocated the use of aggregation of more than one set of features using different signal feature extraction methods to achieve higher performance [19], [23], [26], [43]–[45] in both ASR and ESC tasks. But, most of these works employ just one or two sets of features with a combination of statistical measures. In this paper, instead of just using one or two feature extractors and feeding a one or two channel input to the CNN classifier, we employ four major audio feature extraction techniques to create a four channel input for the Deep CNN. Incorporating different signal processing techniques that extract different types of information provides the CNN with more distinguishable characteristics and complementary feature representations to accurately classify audio signals.

Some previous research works [46], [47], have used multiple features extracted from signals. In [46], multiple features are used with multiple classifiers to compare and analyse their results. But, all features are not used together in a single model. Whereas in [47], multiple features have been used that consist of MFCC, some statistical measurements, logarithmic energy features and voice features. We process audio signals to extract features using the following methods:

1) *MFCC*: The Mel-Frequency Cepstral Coefficients (MFCC) has been one of the standard signal/audio feature extraction technique [7] and has been successfully used to benchmark applications like speaker recognition [48], music information retrieval [49], speech recognition [50]. The development of MFCC was propelled by human auditory perception. MFCCs produce a compact representation of an

audio signal. It differs from other cepstral features in the frequency bands which are on the mel-scale. The detailed five step procedure to extract MFCCs can be found in [51].

2) *GFCC*: The Gammatone Frequency Cepstral Coefficients (GFCC) has also been a popular choice of feature extraction for audio/signal processing [8]. The gammatone filter is a linear filter that is outlined by an impulse response which is a product of a gamma distribution and sinusoidal tone. Hence, the name gammatone. It is especially advantageous to use GFCC with MFCC as they complement each other, due to the capability of GFCC being able to proficiently characterize transient sounds classes such as footsteps and gun-shots [43]. Detailed analysis of the benefits of combining MFCC and GFCC can be found in [44].

3) *CQT*: The Constant Q-transform is a time-frequency analysis technique that is particularly suitable for music audio signals [9], [52], [53]. It is essentially a Gabor wavelet transform, so unlike STFT, it has higher frequency resolution for lower frequencies and higher time resolution for higher frequencies. Due to this, it was shown in [54] that CQT outperformed standard MFCC feature extraction for ESC using CNNs. The results shown in [55], illustrated CQT's ability to capture low-to-mid level frequencies better than MFCC for audio scene classification, which is essentially the same task as ESC.

4) *Chromagram*: Another feature extraction technique that is popular with music information retrieval and processing is the Chromagram [10]. Chroma based features are especially useful for pitch analysis of audio signals. They can be used to distinguish among audio signals by assigning them pitch class profiles. This makes chromagrams particularly proficient in audio structure analysis [56]. We use the STFT (Short-time Fourier Transform) spectrogram to compute chroma features. The implementation has been derived from [57].

The MFCC, GFCC, CQT and Chroma features, with equal dimensions, are stacked together to create a four channel input for the Deep CNN. Each feature plays it's part in the classification task. MFCC acts as the backbone by providing rich features, GFCC adds transient sound features, CQT contributes with better low-to-mid frequency range features and finally Chromagram provides pitch category analysis and signal structure information. Figure 1 shows a graphical representation of the features extracted from an audio signal (Figure 1(a)). All features are normalized between 0 and 1 using min-max normalization. From the figure, we can see the contrast in the values of each feature.

Each spike in the amplitude of the audio signal shown in Fig. 1(a) suggests that audio information is available in that region. Different feature extraction methods interpret this information in different ways. The methods mentioned above represent this information in contrasting ways with each of them giving distinct information. Some features, like the MFCC and GFCC, represent that amplitude spikes with high values (as evident from the colour bar next to the graphs),




Fig. 1: Multiple Feature Channels

whereas CQT and Chromagram represent it with low values (dark regions). The representation of MFCC is completely different as it provides some positive value in every region, with enough discrimination capabilities. On the other hand, the other features act as complementary features that eke out some additional distinguishable features.

Fig. 2(a) shows the Principal Component Analysis (PCA) of




Fig. 2: PCA of Features

the features. We take the first two principal components of the four features we use in our model to create a 2D visualization of the feature space. From the figure we can see that most of features are heavily concentrated in the middle region. But, as shown in Fig. 2(b), we encircle a few regions that different features provide some amount of different information. Indeed some of these regions might contain irrelevant or outlier information that is not of value to classification. But, as seen in the figure these feature extraction techniques do provide unique and complementary information. Chromagram features provide little distinctive information and shown in the results section, it provides little increase to the performance of the model.

There might be more feature channels that can be added to further increase the discrimination strength of the input, but that can also increase the pre-processing overhead, number of kernels required to process the multi-channel input and computational complexity of the whole model. Hence, we restrict the number of channels to 4.




Fig. 3: Attention based DCNN model

B. Deep Convolutional Neural Network: Main Block

We use the Convolutional Neural Network [31] as the audio signal classifier for the ESC task. The architecture of our Deep CNN for environmental sound classification proposed in this paper is shown in Fig. 3. The main block, shown in Table 1, consists of five repetitions of *Conv2D-Conv2D-Conv2D-MaxPool-BatchNorm* with different number of kernels and kernel sizes. Almost all convolutional layers are made up of spatially separable convolutions [27]. However, unlike spatially separable convolutions where an $1 \times m$ kernel is followed by an $m \times 1$ kernel, we use two consecutive $1 \times m$ kernels followed by two $n \times 1$ kernels, where $n \neq m$. All strides are equal to 1.

This is because we separate using the convolution operation on the time and frequency domain. The output $\mathcal{O}_i$ of a convolution operation is given by:

$$\mathcal{O}_i = \phi(W \otimes X_i + b) \quad (1)$$

where, W is the kernel, b is the bias, ϕ is the activation function and X_i is the input. In the case of the ESC task, the input are the features extracted from the audio signals. Each

TABLE I: The Main Blocks

Blocks	Layer	Kernel Size	Pooling Size	# Kernels/ Neurons
Block 1	Conv2D	1x3	-	32
	Conv2D	1x3	-	32
	Conv2D	1x1	-	32
	BatchNorm	-	-	-
	MaxPool2D	-	1x2	-
Block 2	Conv2D	5x1	-	32
	Conv2D	5x1	-	32
	Conv2D	1x1	-	32
	BatchNorm	-	-	-
	MaxPool2D	-	4x1	-
Block 3	Conv2D	1x3	-	64
	Conv2D	1x3	-	64
	Conv2D	1x1	-	64
	BatchNorm	-	-	-
	MaxPool2D	-	1x2	-
Block 4	Conv2D	5x1	-	64
	Conv2D	5x1	-	64
	Conv2D	1x1	-	64
	BatchNorm	-	-	-
	MaxPool2D	-	4x1	-
Block 5	Conv2D	5x3	-	128
	Conv2D	5x3	-	128
	Conv2D	1x1	-	128
	BatchNorm	-	-	-
	MaxPool2D	-	4x2	-
	Flatten	-	-	-
	Dense	-	-	256
	Dense	-	-	# Classes

feature set is of the shape (t, f, c) , where t is the compressed time domain (compressed due to window size and hop length) and c is the number of channels. Each window of time yields f number of features ($f = 128$ in our model). So, we treat the time domain and the feature domain separately. The kernels with the form $1 \times m$ work on the feature domain and the ones with $n \times 1$ work on the time domain.

Using the $1 \times m$ type of convolution operation enables the network to process each set of features from a time window separately. And, the $n \times 1$ type of convolution allows the aggregation of a feature along the time domain. Now, c corresponds to the number of feature extraction methods we adopt (in our model, $c = 4$). So, each kernel works on each channel, which means that all different types of features extracted from the signal feature extraction techniques is aggregated by every kernel. Each kernel can extract different information from an aggregated combination of different feature sets.

Another major advantage of using this type of convolution is the reduction in number of parameters. This is the primary advantage of separable convolutions when they were used

in [27] and have probably been used earlier as well. For a kernel of size $1 \times m$, one dimension of the kernel is 1, it has the same number of parameters as a 1D convolution of kernel size m . But, it has the operational advantage of 2D convolution, as it works on two spatial dimensions.

Also, this type of convolution operates in accordance with the way data is represented. In case of standard square kernels like $n \times n$, which are used for computer vision tasks, the dimensions of the kernel are in accordance to the image's spatial structure. The 2D structure of an image represents pixels, i.e. both dimensions of an image represent the same homogeneous information. Whereas, in case of audio features, one dimension gives a compact representation of frequency features of a time window and the other dimension represents the flow of time (or sliding time window). So, in order to process information accordingly and respect the information from different dimensions of the input, we use $1 \times m$ and $n \times 1$ separable convolutions.

Fig. 4 shows a small example of the difference between




Fig. 4: Separable Convolutions working in the time and feature domains vs Standard Convolutions

separable convolutions and standard square convolutions¹. The y-axis is the time domain (time windows) and the x-axis contains the features extracted in a time window. The red rectangle represents a $1 \times m$ kernel working in the feature domain, the blue rectangle represents a $n \times 1$ kernel working in the time domain and the yellow rectangle represents a $n \times m$ standard kernel. The green arrows give the direction of the kernel's movement. The separable convolutions work on either the time or the feature domain. For example, the red kernel processes all features in time window t^j , by performing a convolution operation (element-wise multiplication and addition) between the kernel weights and features extracted from time window t^j . After moving over all features f^1 to f^n on the time window t^j , the kernel moves to time window t^{j+1} and performs the same

¹An animated gif image is also added in the supplementary material for better visual explanation.

operation by moving over all features in time window t^{j+1} . Similarly, the blue kernel processes the flow of feature f^i by convolving it's kernel weights with the feature f^i for each time window by moving over all time windows t^1 to $t^{n'}$. It continues to do the same for the next feature f^{i+1} . Since both the dimensions convey different information, the data usage efficiency is greater. However, in case of the yellow kernel, if it's a 3×3 kernel, it processes three features f^{i-1} , f^i and f^{i+1} in three time windows t^{j-1} , t^j and t^{j+1} . In this case, there is no consistency in gain of information. It reduces data usage efficiency and increases redundancy since both dimensions have different types of information. The square convolutions work best for images because they have the same information (pixel information) in both dimensions. However, the standard convolution has the advantage of extracting valuable time-feature relationship information which the time and feature separable convolutions ignore. So, we include standard (rectangular) convolutions in the last block (Block 5 in Table 1) to extract this relevant information and also combine the separate time and feature domain information.

The pooling operations are also separate across the time and feature domain, in the same manner as the convolution operations. Note that, the time domain and feature domain kernel sizes are different. This is because $t > f$. These factors make the idea of combining multiple feature extraction methods to create a multi channel input more appealing for a convolutional neural network.

Another advantage of using spatially separable convolutions is that they result in a reduction of parameters. In a standard $n \times n$ kernel, there are n^2 parameters. However, if it is spatially separated into $1 \times n$ and $n \times 1$ kernels, then the number of parameters becomes $2n$. In our case, the 5×3 kernel has 15 parameters, whereas, the time and feature separated kernels, 5×1 and 1×3 , have 8 parameters.

The final batches of convolution and pooling operations combine the time and feature domain by using $n \times m$ kernels. These layers learn additional information across both the time and feature domains and assemble the information for the fully connected layers at the end to get the final solution. Along with separable convolutions, we also add 1×1 convolutions [58]. They act as channel-wise pooling, i.e. they pool across the time and feature domains. Using 1×1 convolutions is like having a fully connected layer which adds learnable parameters and depth to the network and increases the learning capabilities of a model at low computational cost [59].

We also add batch normalization layers [60] after every batch of convolutional layers. We use the Leaky ReLU [61] activation function, in equation 2, after every convolution and fully connected layer (except the last/output layer). We use the softmax function at the final layer to output class probabilities.

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} x, & \text{if } x > 0 \\ 0.01x, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

C. Deep Convolutional Neural Network: Attention Block

Attention based models have mostly been used in ASR [4], [5] and Neural Machine Translation [62]. In these models, Recurrent Neural Network based models have been used for attention, which require the previous encodings, current state (and sometimes previous attention vectors), since in these tasks location information is also necessary. However, for the task of ESC, the whole audio clip (short), is assigned to a category, which means that we require content information rather than location information. The content information here is both available in spatial as well as channel directions. Extracting and making use of both spatial and channel information is tricky. In [41], this was achieved by using two separate attention modules: one for spatial (temporal) and another for channel attention. However, this made the model very complex. In this paper, we achieve spatial and channel wise attention using a single attention module and dramatically reduce the number of parameters required for attention by using depthwise convolutions.

The attention block, shown in Fig. 3, runs in parallel with a main block. It takes the output feature map of the previous layer as it's input. The output of the attention block is element-wise multiplied with the output of the main block. In order for do this, the output dimensions of the attention block and main block must be equal $n \times m \times c$.

The size of the max pooling operation in the beginning and the kernel size of the depthwise convolution ensure that the output of the attention block is the same as the output of the main block. The pooling size in the attention block is the same as the pooling size in the corresponding parallel main block. In standard convolution, each kernel of size $n \times m$ is applied to each channel and if there are c kernels, then this leads to $n \times m \times c^2$ operations. On the other hand, in the depthwise convolution, one kernel is applied to only one channel, which leads to $n \times m \times c$ operations, i.e. a reduction of $1/c$. Note that, c increases exponentially (2^i , where i is the number of layers) every layer.

The depthwise convolution is followed by a 1×1 point-wise convolution to make the number of channels equal to c . So, we get the same output size of $n \times m \times c$, as the main block. But, before the element-wise multiplication of the attention matrix with the main block output, we add a batch normalization layer to normalize the attention weights. Normalization is important for smoothing. The batch-norm layer is followed by a ReLU activation, that makes the attention weight matrix sparse which makes the element-wise multiplication computationally efficient.

$$a^i = \phi(\text{BatchNorm}(f(\text{MaxPool}(l^{i-1})))) \quad (3)$$

$$l^i = a^i \odot \hat{l}^i \quad (4)$$

Equations 3 and 4 make up the attention module, where f is the depthwise separable convolution comprising of depthwise and point-wise convolution and ϕ is the ReLU activation function. This single attention module performs both spatial and channel attention. Channel-wise attention requires an attention weight for each output channel of the

main block and spatial attention requires an attention weight for each spatial location in the output feature map. Our attention module produces c weights, which enables channel attention, and each weight in c is a matrix of $n \times m$, which enables spatial attention. And, using a single depthwise separable convolution layer we are able to achieve this with considerably less number of parameters and operations.

$$k^a = \begin{cases} 1 \times 3, & \text{if } k^m = 1 \times 3 \\ 3 \times 1, & \text{if } k^m = 5 \times 1 \\ 3 \times 3, & \text{if } k^m = 5 \times 3 \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

The kernel size of the depthwise convolution corresponding to the different kernel sizes of the parallel main block is given by equation 5, where k^a is the kernel size for the depthwise convolution in the attention block and k^m is the kernel size of the spatially separable/aggregating convolutions in the main block. An advantage of using attention as a separate module that runs in parallel with every main block and connected before and after each main block, with less number of parameters and layers, is that it allows smooth propagation of the gradient like skip or residual connections [63]–[65]. The results in the next section show that, all these aspects of our model and each feature in the multi channel input contributes towards improving the performance of the system. We exhaustively test our model on the three benchmark ESC datasets: ESC-10, ESC-50 and UrbanSound8K. We achieve state-of-the-art results on all three datasets.

IV. EXPERIMENTS AND RESULTS

We report state-of-the-art results on ESC benchmark datasets, i.e. UrbanSound8K, ESC-10 and ESC-50, using the proposed model. We train and test our model on each of the three benchmark datasets according to the specified folds of training by using k -fold cross validation and averaging the classification accuracy across the folds. For ESC-10 and ESC-50, we use $k = 5$ and for UrbanSound8K, we use $k = 10$. We use Tensorflow [66] and Keras [67] to implement our CNN classifier and Librosa [68], Essentia [69] and the Matlab Signal Processing Toolbox [70] for audio processing and feature extraction. In terms of hardware, we use the NVIDIA DGX-2 consisting of 16 NVIDIA Tesla V100 GPUs with 32 Gigabytes of VRAM each and a system memory of 1.5 Terabytes. For every feature extraction technique, we extract 128 features for each window of length 1024 (3.2 ms) with a hop length of 512 (1.6 ms). We set the sampling rate for all datasets to 32kHz. We normalize all feature vectors to the range between 0 and 1 using min-max normalization. Our DCNN model is trained to minimize the categorical cross-entropy loss using the Adam optimizer [71] with Nestorov momentum [72] with default parameters. In order to avoid overfitting, we use Dropout with ratio 0.25 after the dense layer. To further improve the generalization performance of our model, L_2 regularization was used on the weights of the dense layer with regularization parameter $\lambda = 0.1$. We run our model for 500 epochs per fold. We set the initial learning rate of training to 0.01 and decrease it by a factor of 10 every 100 epochs. As shown in [19], [20], data augmentation plays a very

important role in improving performance, especially when the model is large and data is scarce. Here, we use time stretch, pitch shift and add random gaussian noise as in [20]. These data augmentation techniques improve the accuracy of the model even further. We use a mini-batch size of 200.

Table 2 displays the results of previous state-of-the-art ESC models that tested their methods on one or more of the three benchmark datasets. All of these models have been briefly described in Section 2. The last row of the table shows the results of our proposed model on the three datasets. For the UrbanSound8K dataset, the previous state-of-the-art accuracy was 97.2%, while we achieve 97.52% with our attention based DCNN. However, the previous state-of-the-art accuracies on the ESC-10 and ESC-50 datasets were 92.2% and 86.5% respectively. Whereas, our proposed model gains considerably higher accuracies of 95.75% and 88.50% on the ESC-10 and ESC-50 datasets respectively. This could be partly because some state-of-the-art models on the UrbanSound8K dataset, such as [21], [26], weren't tested on the ESC-10 and ESC-50 datasets. But, it's mostly because ESC-10/ESC-50 datasets have different dynamics compared to the UrbanSound8K dataset. This is evidenced from the fact that almost all models shown in Table 2 get varying accuracies for ESC-10/ESC-50 and UrbanSound8K datasets.

Since ESC-10 and ESC-50 come from exactly the same distribution, the difference in the reported accuracies on them are quite predictable. However, the UrbanSound8K comes from a different distribution and more importantly it is an imbalanced dataset, unlike ESC-10/ESC-50. Also, the UrbanSound8K dataset has varying sampling rate and audio length. We are pointing out these differences to show that despite these dissimilarities, our model is able to achieve very good performance on all three datasets.

From Table 2, we can also see that our proposed model is able to surpass human performance on the ESC-10 and ESC-50 datasets. Now, we show experimental analysis and results of our model on the ESC-10/ESC-50 and UrbanSound8K datasets separately. We show the performance of our model with different feature sets and the benefit of using data augmentation. We also test different architectures of our model. We compare our proposed separable convolutions with standard convolutions. We name our architecture as ADCNN-5, where 5 is the number of sequences of main and attention blocks. The architecture DCNN-5 is without attention. We keep the one fully connected layer and output softmax layer for all architectures.

A. Datasets

We test our model on the well-known benchmark datasets for the task of Environment Sound Classification, namely, ESC-10, ESC-50 and UrbanSound8K.

1) *ESC-10/ESC-50*: The ESC-50 dataset is one of the most widely used environmental sound classification benchmark datasets [29]. It consists of 2000 audio files of 5 seconds length each, sampled at 16kHz and 44.1kHz. We use the set of audio files sampled at 44.1kHz and downsample them to 32kHz. The recordings in the ESC-50 dataset are categorized into 50 balanced and disjoint classes. The sounds can be divided

TABLE II: Previous state-of-the-art ESC models vs Proposed model

Model	ESC-10	ESC-50	US8K
Human [29]	95.70	81.30	-
EnvNet [18]	86.80	66.40	66.30
EnvNet+logmel-CNN [18]	88.10	74.10	71.10
EnvNetv2 [22]	88.80	81.60	76.60
EnvNetv2+strong augment [22]	91.30	84.70	78.30
M18 [25]	-	-	71.68
SoundNet [37]	92.20	74.20	-
PiczakCNN [23]	90.20	64.50	73.70
Multilevel Features+Multi-temporal resolution CNN [34]	-	75.10	-
AlexNet [40]	86.00	65.00	92.00
GoogleNet [40]	86.00	73.00	93.00
SB-CNN [20]	-	-	79.00
CNN+Augment+Mixup [19]	91.70	83.90	83.70
GTSC $\oplus$ TEO-GTSC [33]	-	81.95	88.02
PEFBes [32]	-	73.25	-
FBEs $\oplus$ PEFBes [32]	-	84.15	-
ConvRBM-BANK [36]	-	78.45	-
FBEs $\oplus$ ConvRBM-BANK [36]	-	86.50	-
CRNN+channel & temporal Attention [41]	94.20	86.50	-
Multi-stream+temporal Attention [42]	94.20	84.00	-
1D-CNN Random [21]	-	-	87.00
1D-CNN Gamma [21]	-	-	89.00
LMCNet [26]	-	-	95.20
MCNet [26]	-	-	95.30
TSCNN-DS [26]	-	-	97.20
Multiple Feature Channel + Deep CNN with Attention (Proposed)	95.75	88.50	97.52

into 5 major groups: animals, natural soundscapes and water sounds, human non-speech sounds, interior/domestic sounds, and exterior/urban sounds. The dataset has been pre-arranged into 5 folds for unbiased comparable results. We use these pre-determined folds with 5-fold cross validation and report the average accuracy of our model across the 5 predefined folds, as mentioned in [29].

The ESC-10 is a subset of the ESC-50 dataset that consists of 10 balanced and disjoint classes (dog bark, rain, sea waves, baby cry, clock tick, person sneeze, helicopter, chainsaw, rooster, fire crackling) of 400 audio files. It uses the same implementation of pre-arranged 5 folds, which we follow for testing our model. We train our model for 500 epochs per fold and test the model on the remaining fold. We calculate the average of this test accuracy for all folds.

2) *UrbanSound8K*: The UrbanSound8K is a bigger dataset compared to ESC-10/ESC-50, with a collection of 8732 short (less than 4 seconds) audio clips of various environment sound sources [30]. It has also been widely used by researchers as a benchmarking dataset for their ESC models. Unlike ESC-50, the UrbanSound8K has varying sample rates for audio files.

We sample the audio files at 32kHz. The dataset consists of audio signals categorised into 10 disjoint imbalanced classes: air conditioner, car horn, playing children, dog bark, drilling, engine idling, gun shot, jackhammer, siren, street music. So, even though UrbanSound8K has less categories than ESC-50, it has the class imbalance problem which makes generalization difficult.

The dataset has been pre-arranged into 10 folds for unbiased comparable results. We use these pre-determined folds with 10-fold cross validation and report the average accuracy of our model across the 10 predefined folds, as mentioned in [30]. We train our model for 500 epochs per fold and test the model on the remaining fold. We calculate the average of this test accuracy for all folds.

B. Results

Each of these datasets possesses different characteristics that makes classification difficult. The ESC-50 is a difficult dataset to classify due to its small size and large number of classes. We exhaustively test our model on this dataset and experimentally show the importance of having multi-channel feature input, attention, data augmentation, model size and separable convolutions. The UrbanSound8K dataset, like the ESC-50 dataset, presents many challenges like imbalance class distribution and varying sampling rates.

In Table 3, we show the effects of different feature sets and data augmentation on the model's performance on the ESC-50 and UrbanSound8K datasets². The accuracy of the model is at its best with the full feature set, attention and data augmentation. Adding more features might have increased performance even further, but it would have increased the computational cost as well. As mentioned above, we use time stretch, pitch shift and add random gaussian noise to the audio signals as in [20]. Augmentation plays an important role in elevating the performance of our system as shown in Table 3. Table 3 also shows the impact of using different combinations of MFCC, GFCC, CQT and Chroma features to create the feature set input for the ADCNN-5 model. With a single feature set, MFCC gives the best performance, closely followed by CQT. Same is the case with two and three feature combinations. Combining features with MFCC gives the highest performance boost, followed by CQT feature combinations. The Chromagram features act as add-on features that give a small rise in model accuracy. These findings are consistent among both the ESC-50 and UrbanSound8K datasets with difference being the amount of increase/decrease in accuracy, since the datasets are of different sizes. Data augmentation also has consistent and uniform performance effects on all the different feature sets.

Using separable convolutions (spatial or depthwise), has the advantage of reducing the number of parameters in the model. We use spatially separable convolutions in our main block and depthwise separable convolutions in the attention block. In Table 4, we show the effect of using separable convolutions in terms of the number of parameters and model

²The results shown in this section use data augmentation in all cases, unless mentioned otherwise.

TABLE III: Performance on the ESC-50 and UrbanSound8K
Impact of combinations of different feature sets with and without
augmentation

Model	DA*	MFCC	GFCC	CQT	Chroma	ESC-50	US8K
ADCNN-5	Yes	✓				80.25	88.45
			✓			78.15	87.12
				✓		79.92	87.75
					✓	72.45	82.20
		✓	✓			83.25	92.50
		✓		✓		83.50	94.35
		✓			✓	81.75	89.65
			✓	✓		81.52	90.86
			✓		✓	79.95	88.56
				✓	✓	80.65	89.75
		✓	✓	✓		86.75	96.85
		✓	✓		✓	84.35	94.90
		✓		✓	✓	85.65	95.55
			✓	✓	✓	84.15	93.25
		✓	✓	✓	✓	88.50	97.52
ADCNN-5	No	✓				75.65	85.50
			✓			73.50	83.85
				✓		74.25	84.75
					✓	69.35	79.25
		✓	✓			79.12	88.25
		✓		✓		78.55	89.50
		✓			✓	76.30	86.15
			✓	✓		77.62	86.32
			✓		✓	74.75	84.45
				✓	✓	75.15	85.22
		✓	✓	✓		83.95	92.90
		✓	✓		✓	82.22	89.85
		✓		✓	✓	83.02	90.65
			✓	✓	✓	79.10	88.32
		✓	✓	✓	✓	85.12	94.25

*DA stands for Data Augmentation.

performance. The DCNN-5 is the model without attention and DCNN-5 SC is with standard convolutions instead of separable convolutions. The separable convolutions, 1×3 and 5×1 , is replaced by 5×3 convolution operation. We also remove the pooling layers in block 1 and 2 to keep the model depth valid according to the input, since standard rectangular convolutions reduce the output dimensions more quickly.

From Table 4, we can see that, for the task of environment

TABLE IV: Performance comparison of Number of
parameters on ESC-50 and UrbanSound8K

Model	Parameters ESC-50	ESC-50	Parameters US8K	US8K
DCNN-5	1.27M	85.25	0.87M	94.25
ADCNN-5	1.29M	88.50	0.89M	97.52
DCNN-5 SC	1.40M	82.45	1.04M	91.25
ADCNN-5 (without Depthwise Sep. Conv.)	1.36M	87.05	0.97M	96.35

sound classification, the spatially separable convolutions have less number of parameters and perform better than standard convolutions. DCNN-5 SC has 130K more parameters than

DCNN-5 and obtains 2.8% lower accuracy than DCNN-5 on the ESC-50. Adding the attention mechanism just adds 20K more parameters and increases the performance by 3.25% (ADCNN-5 vs DCNN-5). This is because of the depthwise separable convolutions we use to obtain the attention weights. Using standard convolutions to build the attention model results in an increase of 90K parameters and 1.8% accuracy (ADCNN-5 without depthwise conv. vs DCNN-5). So, the by using depthwise separable convolution attention, we are able to achieve a reduction of 70K parameters and an increase of 1.45% accuracy over standard convolution attention on the ESC-50 dataset (ADCNN-5 vs ADCNN-5 without depthwise conv.).

The results are similar for the UrbanSound8K dataset. Spatially separable convolutions in DCNN-5 reduce the number of parameters by 170K and increase performance by 3% over the DCNN-5 SC. Adding the depthwise separable attention mechanism adds just 20K parameters and further boosts performance by 3.27% (ADCNN-5 vs DCNN-5). Whereas, without depthwise separable convolutions in the attention blocks, the performance drops by 1.17% and parameters increase by 80K (ADCNN-5 vs ADCNN-5 without depthwise conv.). The difference in the number of parameters between the datasets for the same models is because of the difference in input shapes. UrbanSound8K has 4 seconds long audio files, whereas, ESC-50 has 5 seconds long. So, both of them sampled at 32kHz produce different number of time windows. The input shape for ESC-50 is $\langle 313, 128, 4 \rangle$ and for UrbanSound8K is $\langle 250, 128, 4 \rangle$ represented as $\langle \text{time-windows}, \text{features}, \text{channels} \rangle$.

TABLE V: Performance comparison between different model
depths on ESC-50 and UrbanSound8K

Model	ESC-50	US8K
ADCNN-3	80.25	88.75
ADCNN-4	85.22	94.50
ADCNN-5	88.50	97.52
ADCNN-6	87.15	97.15
ADCNN-7	87.50	95.25

We also experiment with the depth of our model by varying the number of blocks from 3 to 7. We only add or remove blocks like block 1 to 4. A single aggregating block (block 5) at the end is common for all architectures. To increase the depth beyond 5 blocks, we remove the pooling layers. For ADCNN-6 and ADCNN-7, we remove the pooling layers of the first and second blocks. From Table 5, we can see that the ADCNN-5 architecture performs the best. We suspect that the performance drops when the depth goes beyond 5 blocks due to overfitting since the number of trainable parameters increase with depth. For the shallower models, there aren't enough parameters to learn the patterns of the input data.

We also test our model with fewer number of features extracted by the audio feature extraction methods. Table 6 shows the results when the number of features are reduced. The model accuracy monotonically increases with the increase

TABLE VI: Performance of different number of feature coefficients on ESC-50 and UrbanSound8K

Model	# Features	ESC-50	US8K
ADCNN-5	48	80.12	89.25
	64	85.25	94.25
	96	86.45	95.50
	128	88.50	97.52

in the number of features. We stop at 128 features, which produces the best results, because more features add more complexity to the model. Also, increase in the number of features will result in much higher execution time for the feature extraction phase.

The same tests were conducted on the ESC-10 dataset. The results were consistent with the findings shown above. ESC-10 is a subset of the ESC-50 dataset. We also report state-of-the-art performance on the ESC-10 dataset with 95.75% accuracy. We have exhaustively tested our model with different variations and experimentally showing the reason behind choosing the specific components of our model. We show the importance of data augmentation in further increasing accuracy by a margin of $\sim 3\%$, which is in line with the findings of [20], and using separable convolutions that separate the processing of time and feature domain information. We also show the importance of the multi-channel feature input and the increase in performance that one can achieve from carefully selecting multiple complementary feature extraction techniques. Our attention mechanism also boosts performance with a very small increase in the number of parameters, courtesy of the depthwise separable convolution. We explore the size of our DCNN model and choose the ADCNN-5 based on its performance. Our system of multiple feature channel input and separable convolutions Attention based Deep CNN, with data augmentation achieves state-of-the-art performance on all three environmental sound classification benchmark datasets.

V. CONCLUSION

We propose a novel approach for environmental sound classification that consists of multiple feature channels and attention based deep convolutional neural network with domain wise convolutions. We combine feature extraction methods like the MFCC, GFCC, CQT and Chromagram to create a multi channel input for the CNN classifier. Each of these feature sets provide some specific and discriminatory information that increases classification accuracy. As the results suggest, each feature set contributes in boosting performance of the model. The model consists of two block: Main block and Attention block. We employ a Deep CNN consisting of separable convolutions, pooling, 1×1 convolution and batch normalization layers along with Leaky ReLU activation, dropout and L_2 regularization in the main block. The convolution and pooling layers, in the main block, work on the time and feature domains separately. Along side the main block, we also use an attention mechanism that consists of depthwise separable convolution which produces an attention matrix for each channel of the corresponding parallel main block. Both channel and

spatial attention are achieved using a small increase in number of parameters and operations. We test our model on the three benchmark datasets: ESC-10, ESC-50 and UrbanSound8K. We use simple data augmentation techniques like time stretch, pitch shift and add some random gaussian noise to further improve performance. Our model achieves 95.75%, 88.50% and 97.52% accuracy on ESC-10, ESC-50 and UrbanSound8K respectively, which is state-of-the-art performance on all three datasets. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time when a model has achieved state-of-the-art performance on all three benchmark datasets. Although, further performance boost may be achieved by hyperparameter and architecture fine tuning. But, we leave that for future work.

REFERENCES

- [1] Dong Yu and Li Deng. *Automatic Speech Recognition: A Deep Learning Approach*. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 2014.
- [2] Dong Yu and Li Deng. *Deep Neural Network-Hidden Markov Model Hybrid Systems*, pages 99–116. Springer London, London, 2015.
- [3] Liang Lu, Xingxing Zhang, Kyunghyun Cho, and Steve Renals. A study of the recurrent neural network encoder-decoder for large vocabulary speech recognition. In *Sixteenth Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association*, 2015.
- [4] W. Chan, N. Jaitly, Q. Le, and O. Vinyals. Listen, attend and spell: A neural network for large vocabulary conversational speech recognition. In *2016 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 4960–4964, March 2016.
- [5] Chung-Cheng Chiu, Tara N. Sainath, Yonghui Wu, Rohit Prabhavalkar, Patrick Nguyen, Zhifeng Chen, Anjuli Kannan, Ron J. Weiss, Kanishka Rao, Katya Gonina, Navdeep Jaitly, Bo Li, Jan Chorowski, and Michiel Bacchiani. State-of-the-art speech recognition with sequence-to-sequence models. *CoRR*, abs/1712.01769, 2017.
- [6] T. N. Sainath, O. Vinyals, A. Senior, and H. Sak. Convolutional, long short-term memory, fully connected deep neural networks. In *2015 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 4580–4584, April 2015.
- [7] S. Davis and P. Mermelstein. Comparison of parametric representations for monosyllabic word recognition in continuously spoken sentences. *IEEE Transactions on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, 28(4):357–366, August 1980.
- [8] Y. Shao, Z. Jin, D. Wang, and S. Srinivasan. An auditory-based feature for robust speech recognition. In *2009 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, pages 4625–4628, April 2009.
- [9] Christian Schölkhuber. Constant-q transform toolbox for music processing. 2010.
- [10] Roger N Shepard. Circularity in judgments of relative pitch. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 36(12):2346–2353, 1964.
- [11] Yizhar Lavner and Dima Ruinskiy. A decision-tree-based algorithm for speech/music classification and segmentation. *EURASIP Journal on Audio, Speech, and Music Processing*, 2009(1):239892, Jun 2009.
- [12] Chun-Yan Yu, Huang Liu, and Zi-Ming Qi. Sound event detection using deep random forest. Technical report, Technical report, DCASE2017 Challenge, 2017.
- [13] Wang Shuiping, Tang Zhenming, and Li Shiqiang. Design and implementation of an audio classification system based on svm. *Procedia Engineering*, 15:4031 – 4035, 2011. CEIS 2011.
- [14] Shruti Aggarwal and Naveen Aggarwal. Classification of audio data using support vector machine. 2011.
- [15] Jia-Ching Wang, Jhing-Fa Wang, Cai-Bei Lin, Kun-Ting Jian, and W. Kuok. Content-based audio classification using support vector machines and independent component analysis. In *18th International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR'06)*, volume 4, pages 157–160, Aug 2006.
- [16] Musatafa Abbas Abbood Albadr, Sabrina Tiun, Fahad Taha AL-Dhief, and Mahmoud A. M. Sammour. Spoken language identification based on the enhanced self-adjusting extreme learning machine approach. *PLOS ONE*, 13(4):1–27, 04 2018.
- [17] S. Scardapane, D. Comminiello, M. Scarpiniti, and A. Uncini. Music classification using extreme learning machines. In *2013 8th International Symposium on Image and Signal Processing and Analysis (ISPA)*, pages 377–381, Sep. 2013.

- [18] Y. Tokozume and T. Harada. Learning environmental sounds with end-to-end convolutional neural network. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 2721–2725, March 2017.
- [19] Zhichao Zhang, Shugong Xu, Shan Cao, and Shunqing Zhang. Deep convolutional neural network with mixup for environmental sound classification. In Jian-Huang Lai, Cheng-Lin Liu, Xilin Chen, Jie Zhou, Tieniu Tan, Nanning Zheng, and Hongbin Zha, editors, *Pattern Recognition and Computer Vision*, pages 356–367, Cham, 2018. Springer International Publishing.
- [20] Justin Salamon and Juan Pablo Bello. Deep convolutional neural networks and data augmentation for environmental sound classification. *CoRR*, abs/1608.04363, 2016.
- [21] Sajjad Abdoli, Patrick Cardinal, and Alessandro Lameiras Koerich. End-to-end environmental sound classification using a 1d convolutional neural network. *CoRR*, abs/1904.08990, 2019.
- [22] Yuji Tokozume, Yoshitaka Ushiku, and Tatsuya Harada. Learning from between-class examples for deep sound recognition. *CoRR*, abs/1711.10282, 2017.
- [23] K. J. Piczak. Environmental sound classification with convolutional neural networks. In *2015 IEEE 25th International Workshop on Machine Learning for Signal Processing (MLSP)*, pages 1–6, Sep. 2015.
- [24] Jordi Pons and Xavier Serra. Randomly weighted cnns for (music) audio classification. *CoRR*, abs/1805.00237, 2018.
- [25] Wei Dai, Chia Dai, Shuhui Qu, Juncheng Li, and Samarjit Das. Very deep convolutional neural networks for raw waveforms. *CoRR*, abs/1610.00087, 2016.
- [26] Yu Su, Ke Zhang, Jingyu Wang, and Kurosh Madani. Environment sound classification using a two-stream cnn based on decision-level fusion. *Sensors*, 19(7), 2019.
- [27] Franck Mamalet and Christophe Garcia. Simplifying convnets for fast learning. In Alessandro E. P. Villa, Włodzisław Duch, Péter Érdi, Francesco Masulli, and Günther Palm, editors, *Artificial Neural Networks and Machine Learning – ICANN 2012*, pages 58–65, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2012. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [28] François Chollet. Xception: Deep learning with depthwise separable convolutions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1251–1258, 2017.
- [29] Karol J. Piczak. ESC: Dataset for Environmental Sound Classification. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual ACM Conference on Multimedia*, pages 1015–1018. ACM Press.
- [30] Justin Salamon, Christopher Jacoby, and Juan Pablo Bello. A dataset and taxonomy for urban sound research. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, MM '14, pages 1041–1044, New York, NY, USA, 2014. ACM.
- [31] Y. Lecun, L. Bottou, Y. Bengio, and P. Haffner. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 86(11):2278–2324, Nov 1998.
- [32] Rishabh N. Tak, Dharmesh M. Agrawal, and Hemant A. Patil. Novel phase encoded mel filterbank energies for environmental sound classification. In B. Uma Shankar, Kuntal Ghosh, Deba Prasad Mandal, Shubhra Sankar Ray, David Zhang, and Sankar K. Pal, editors, *Pattern Recognition and Machine Intelligence*, pages 317–325, Cham, 2017. Springer International Publishing.
- [33] D. M. Agrawal, H. B. Sailor, M. H. Soni, and H. A. Patil. Novel teo-based gammatone features for environmental sound classification. In *2017 25th European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO)*, pages 1809–1813, Aug 2017.
- [34] Boqing Zhu, Kele Xu, Dezhi Wang, Lilun Zhang, Bo Li, and Yuxing Peng. Environmental sound classification based on multi-temporal resolution CNN network combining with multi-level features. *CoRR*, abs/1805.09752, 2018.
- [35] Gao Huang, Zhuang Liu, and Kilian Q. Weinberger. Densely connected convolutional networks. *CoRR*, abs/1608.06993, 2016.
- [36] J. Salamon and J. P. Bello. Unsupervised feature learning for urban sound classification. In *2015 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 171–175, April 2015.
- [37] Yusuf Aytar, Carl Vondrick, and Antonio Torralba. Soundnet: Learning sound representations from unlabeled video. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, NIPS'16, pages 892–900, USA, 2016. Curran Associates Inc.
- [38] Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E. Hinton. Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems - Volume 1*, NIPS'12, pages 1097–1105, USA, 2012. Curran Associates Inc.
- [39] Christian Szegedy, Wei Liu, Yangqing Jia, Pierre Sermanet, Scott Reed, Dragomir Anguelov, Dumitru Erhan, Vincent Vanhoucke, and Andrew Rabinovich. Going deeper with convolutions. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2015.
- [40] Venkatesh Boddapati, Andrej Petef, Jim Rasmusson, and Lars Lundberg. Classifying environmental sounds using image recognition networks. *Procedia Computer Science*, 112:2048 – 2056, 2017. Knowledge-Based and Intelligent Information and Engineering Systems: Proceedings of the 21st International Conference, KES-2017-8 September 2017, Marseille, France.
- [41] Z. Zhang, S. Xu, S. Zhang, T. Qiao, and S. Cao. Learning attentive representations for environmental sound classification. *IEEE Access*, 7:130327–130339, 2019.
- [42] Xinyu Li, Venkata Chebiiyam, and Katrin Kirchhoff. Multi-stream network with temporal attention for environmental sound classification. *CoRR*, abs/1901.08608, 2019.
- [43] S. Chachada and C. J. Kuo. Environmental sound recognition: A survey. In *2013 Asia-Pacific Signal and Information Processing Association Annual Summit and Conference*, pages 1–9, Oct 2013.
- [44] Wilson Burgos. *Gammatone and MFCC Features in Speaker Recognition (Doctoral Dissertation)*. PhD thesis, 2014.
- [45] Deepanway Ghosal and Maheshkumar H Kolekar. Music genre recognition using deep neural networks and transfer learning. In *InterSpeech*, pages 2087–2019, 2018.
- [46] J. Li, W. Dai, F. Metz, S. Qu, and S. Das. A comparison of deep learning methods for environmental sound detection. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 126–130, March 2017.
- [47] J. T. Geiger, B. Schuller, and G. Rigoll. Large-scale audio feature extraction and svm for acoustic scene classification. In *2013 IEEE Workshop on Applications of Signal Processing to Audio and Acoustics*, pages 1–4, Oct 2013.
- [48] Md. Sahidullah and Goutam Saha. Design, analysis and experimental evaluation of block based transformation in mfcc computation for speaker recognition. *Speech Communication*, 54(4):543 – 565, 2012.
- [49] Meinard Müller. *Information Retrieval for Music and Motion*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2007.
- [50] V. Tyagi and C. Wellekens. On desensitizing the mel-cepstrum to spurious spectral components for robust speech recognition. In *Proceedings. (ICASSP '05). IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing, 2005.*, volume 1, pages I/529–I/532 Vol. 1, March 2005.
- [51] Beth Logan. Mel frequency cepstral coefficients for music modeling. In *ISMIR*, volume 270, pages 1–11, October 2000.
- [52] Judith C Brown. Calculation of a constant q spectral transform. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 89(1):425–434, 1991.
- [53] Sicong Huang, Qiyang Li, Cem Anil, Xuchan Bao, Sageev Oore, and Roger B. Grosse. Timbretron: A wavenet(cyclelegan(cqt(audio))) pipeline for musical timbre transfer. *CoRR*, abs/1811.09620, 2018.
- [54] Muhammad Huzaifah. Comparison of time-frequency representations for environmental sound classification using convolutional neural networks. *CoRR*, abs/1706.07156, 2017.
- [55] Thomas Lidy and Alexander Schindler. Cqt-based convolutional neural networks for audio scene classification. In *Proceedings of the Detection and Classification of Acoustic Scenes and Events 2016 Workshop (DCASE2016)*, volume 90, pages 1032–1048. DCASE2016 Challenge, 2016.
- [56] Jouni Paulus, Meinard Müller, and Anssi Klapuri. State of the art report: Audio-based music structure analysis. In *International Society for Music Information Retrieval*, pages 625–636, Aug 2010.
- [57] Dan Ellis. Chroma feature analysis and synthesis, April 2007.
- [58] Christian Szegedy, Wei Liu, Yangqing Jia, Pierre Sermanet, Scott Reed, Dragomir Anguelov, Dumitru Erhan, Vincent Vanhoucke, and Andrew Rabinovich. Going deeper with convolutions. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2015.
- [59] Min Lin, Qiang Chen, and Shuicheng Yan. Network in network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.4400*, 2013.
- [60] Sergey Ioffe and Christian Szegedy. Batch normalization: Accelerating deep network training by reducing internal covariate shift. *CoRR*, abs/1502.03167, 2015.
- [61] Bing Xu, Naiyan Wang, Tianqi Chen, and Mu Li. Empirical evaluation of rectified activations in convolutional network. *CoRR*, abs/1505.00853, 2015.
- [62] Thang Luong, Hieu Pham, and Christopher D. Manning. Effective approaches to attention-based neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language*

- Processing*, pages 1412–1421, Lisbon, Portugal, September 2015. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [63] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. *CoRR*, abs/1512.03385, 2015.
 - [64] Mohammad Sadegh Ebrahimi and Hossein Karkeh Abadi. Study of residual networks for image recognition. *CoRR*, abs/1805.00325, 2018.
 - [65] A. Emin Orhan. Skip connections as effective symmetry-breaking. *CoRR*, abs/1701.09175, 2017.
 - [66] Martín Abadi, Ashish Agarwal, Paul Barham, Eugene Brevdo, Zhifeng Chen, Craig Citro, Greg S. Corrado, Andy Davis, Jeffrey Dean, Matthieu Devin, Sanjay Ghemawat, Ian Goodfellow, Andrew Harp, Geoffrey Irving, Michael Isard, Yangqing Jia, Rafal Jozefowicz, Lukasz Kaiser, Manjunath Kudlur, Josh Levenberg, Dan Mané, Rajat Monga, Sherry Moore, Derek Murray, Chris Olah, Mike Schuster, Jonathon Shlens, Benoit Steiner, Ilya Sutskever, Kunal Talwar, Paul Tucker, Vincent Vanhoucke, Vijay Vasudevan, Fernanda Viégas, Oriol Vinyals, Pete Warden, Martin Wattenberg, Martin Wicke, Yuan Yu, and Xiaoqiang Zheng. TensorFlow: Large-scale machine learning on heterogeneous systems, 2015. Software available from tensorflow.org.
 - [67] François Chollet et al. Keras. <https://keras.io>, 2015.
 - [68] Brian McFee, Colin Raffel, Dawen Liang, Daniel PW Ellis, Matt McVicar, Eric Battenberg, and Oriol Nieto. librosa: Audio and music signal analysis in python. 2015.
 - [69] Dmitry Bogdanov, Nicolas Wack, Emilia Gómez, Sankalp Gulati, Perfecto Herrera, O. Mayor, Gerard Roma, Justin Salamon, J. R. Zapata, and Xavier Serra. Essentia: an audio analysis library for music information retrieval. In *International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference (ISMIR'13)*, pages 493–498, Curitiba, Brazil, 04/11/2013 2013.
 - [70] *MATLAB Signal Processing Toolbox 2019*. The MathWorks Inc., Natick, Massachusetts, United States, 2019.
 - [71] D.P. Kingma and L.J. Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In *ICLR, International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, page 13, San Diego, CA, USA, 7–9 May 2015. Ithaca, NY: arXiv.org.
 - [72] Ilya Sutskever, James Martens, George Dahl, and Geoffrey Hinton. On the importance of initialization and momentum in deep learning. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1139–1147, 2013.