

---

# Speech Separation based on Contrastive Learning and Deep Modularization

---

**Peter Ochieng**

Department of Computer Science.  
University of Cambridge.  
po304@cam.ac.uk.

## Abstract

The current monaural state of the art tools for speech separation relies on supervised learning. This means that they must deal with permutation problem, they are impacted by the mismatch on the number of speakers used in training and inference. Moreover, their performance heavily relies on the presence of high-quality labelled data. These problems can be effectively addressed by employing a fully unsupervised technique for speech separation. In this paper, we use contrastive learning to establish the representations of frames then use the learned representations in the downstream deep modularization task. Concretely, we demonstrate experimentally that in speech separation, different frames of a speaker can be viewed as augmentations of a given hidden standard frame of that speaker. The frames of a speaker contain enough prosodic information overlap which is key in speech separation. Based on this, we implement a self-supervised learning to learn to minimize the distance between frames belonging to a given speaker. The learned representations are used in a downstream deep modularization task to cluster frames based on speaker identity. Evaluation of the developed technique on WSJ0-2mix and WSJ0-3mix shows that the technique attains SI-SNRi and SDRi of 20.8 and 21.0 respectively in WSJ0-2mix. In WSJ0-3mix, it attains SI-SNRi and SDRi of 20.7 and 20.7 respectively in WSJ0-2mix. Its greatest strength being that as the number of speakers increase, its performance does not degrade significantly.

## 1 Introduction

Monaural speech enhancement involves isolating target speech from a mixture obtained from a single microphone [1]. It has applications in multiple domains such as automatic speech recognition, mobile speech communication and designing of hearing aids [2]. Initial research on speech enhancement exploited techniques such as non-negative matrix factorization [3] [4] [5] probabilistic models [6] and computational auditory scene analysis (CASA)[7]. However, these techniques are tailored to closed-set speakers (i.e., do not work well with mixtures with unknown speakers) which significantly restricts their application in real environments. Due to the recent success of deep learning models in different domains such natural language processing and computer vision, these data driven techniques have been introduced to process audio dataset. In particular, DNN models have become popular in speech enhancement and have achieved great performance in terms of boosting speech intelligibility and its ability to enhance speech with unknown speakers [8] [9]. Speech enhancement DNN models must extract important features of speech, maintain order of audio frames, exploit both local and global contextual information in order to achieve coherent separation of speech data. One of the most challenging types of speech enhancement is multi-speaker speech separation (i.e., identifying multiple target speech in each mixture and separating them). The goal of speech separation is to estimate each target speech  $x_c$  composed in a mixture  $y(n)$  (see equation 1). The mixture  $y(n)$  is

composed of  $C$  independent  $x_c(n)$  speech signals with  $c = 1, \dots, C$ .

$$y(n) = \sum_{c=1}^C x_c(n) \quad (1)$$

Here,  $n$  indexes time. Separating speech from another speech is a daunting task by the virtue that all speakers belong to the same class and share similar characteristics[10]. Some models such as [11] and [12] lessen this task by performing speech separation on a mixed speech signal based on gender voices present. They exploit the fact that there is large discrepancy between male and female voices in terms of vocal track, fundamental frequency contour, timing, rhythm, dynamic range etc. This results in a large spectral distance between male and female speakers in most cases to facilitate a good gender segregation. For speech separation that the mixture involves speakers of the same gender, the separation task is much difficult since the pitch of the voice is in the same range[10]. Models such as [13] [14] [15] [16] [10] and [8] cast the problem of multi-speaker recognition as a multi-class regression. In that case, training a DNN model involves comparing its output to a source speaker. These DNN models always output a dimension for each target class and when multiple sources of the same type exist, the system needs to select arbitrarily which output dimension to map to each output and this raises a permutation problem [10]. Therefore, systems that perform multi-speaker separation have an extra burden of designing mechanisms that are geared towards handling the permutation problem. There are several strategies that are being implemented by speech separation tools to tackle permutation problem. Work in [17] and [18] introduce permutation invariant training (PIT) technique of computing permutation loss such that permutations of reference labels are presented as a set to be compared with the output of the system. The permutation with the lowest loss is adopted as the correct order. For a system that performs  $S$  speaker separation where,  $S$  is high (e.g. 10), implementation of PIT which has a computation complexity of  $O(S!)$  is computationally expensive [19] [20]. Due to this, [20] casts the permutation problem as a linear sum problem where Hungarian algorithm is exploited to find the permutation which minimizes the loss at computation complexity of  $O(S^3)$ . Work in [19] proposes SinkPIT loss which is based on Sinkhorn’s matrix balancing algorithm. They utilize the loss to reduce the complexity of PIT loss from  $O(C!)$  to  $O(kC^2)$ . Another prominent technique of handling permutation problem is to employ a DNN clustering technique [21] [22] [16] [23] [24] to identify the multiple speakers present in a mixed speech signal. The DNN  $f_\theta$  accepts as its input the whole spectrogram  $X$  and generates a  $D$  dimension embedding vector  $V$  i.e.  $V = f_\theta(X) \in R^{N \times D}$ . Here, the embedding  $V$  learns the features of the spectrogram  $X$  and is considered a permutation- and cardinality-independent encoding of the network’s estimate of the signal partition. For the network  $f_\theta$  to be learn how to generate an embedding vector  $V$  given the input  $X$ , it is trained to minimize the cost function.

$$C_Y(V) = \|VV^T - YY^T\|_F^2 = \sum_{ij} (\langle v_i, v_j \rangle - \langle y_i, y_j \rangle)^2 \quad (2)$$

Here,  $Y = \{y_{i,c}\}$  represents the target partition that maps the spectrogram  $S_i$  to each of the  $C$  clusters such that  $y_{i,c}=1$  if element  $i$  is in cluster  $c$ .  $YY^T$  is taken here as a binary affinity matrix that represents the cluster assignment in a partition-independent way. The goal in equation 2 is to minimise the distance between the network estimated affinity matrix  $VV^T$  and the true affinity matrix  $YY^T$ . The minimization is done over the training examples.  $\|A\|_F^2$  is the squared Frobenius norm. Once  $V$  has been established, its rows are clustered into partitions that will represent the binary masks. To cluster the rows  $v_i$  of  $V$ ,  $k$ -means clustering algorithm is used. The resulting clusters of  $V$  are then used as binary masks to separate the sources by applying the masks on mixed spectrogram  $X$ . The separated sources are then reconstructed separated by using inverse STFT.

Another major challenge faced by DNN models performing multi-speaker separation is the mismatch on the number of speakers between training and inference [25]. This arises when a speech separation model was trained on  $n$  speaker mixtures but is being tested on  $t \neq n$  speaker mixtures. The PIT-based methods cannot directly deal with this problem due to their fixed output dimension. Most speech separation models such as [26] [18] [27] [28] deal with the problem by setting a maximum number of sources  $C$  that the model should output from any given mixture. If an inference mixture has  $K$  sources, where  $C > K$ ,  $C - K$  outputs are invalid, and the model needs to have techniques to handle the invalid sources. In case of invalid sources, some models such as [27], [26], [18] design the model to output silences for invalid sources while [28] outputs the mixture itself which are then discarded by comparing the energy level of the outputs relative to the mixture. The challenge with

models that output silences for invalid sources is that they rely on a pre-defined energy threshold, which may be problematic if the mixture also has a very low energy [28]. Some models handle the output dimension mismatch problem by generating a single speech in each iteration and subtracting it from the mixture until no speech is left [29], [30], [31][32], [33]. The iterative technique despite being trained with a mixture with low number of sources can generalize to mixtures with a higher number of sources [31]. It however faces criticism that setting iteration termination criteria is difficult and the separation performance decreases in later iterations due degradations introduced in prior iterations[31]. While DNN clustering techniques in [21] [22] [16] [23] and [24] solve the permutation problem, they unable to effectively deal the mismatch on the number of speakers problem since they rely on supervised learning to train the models. Further, the existing DNN clustering technique require that the number of clusters  $k$  be known beforehand which may not be practical in all cases.

In summary, though the existing multi-speaker-speech separation models have been able to achieve significant success in improving speech intelligibility, majority of them rely on supervised training which introduces the permutation problem and are unable to effectively deal with mixture mismatch problem. Moreover, supervised training is always reliant on the availability of quality labelled data that can be costly to curate. In this work, we seek address fore mentioned challenges by introducing a fully unsupervised technique for multi-speaker speech separation that can perform speech separation without priori knowledge of the number of speakers in the mixture. The proposed method is based on joint-embedding self-supervised learning and deep learning based modularization. The key hypothesis that we investigate is if the different frames extracted from speech of a speaker can be viewed as augmentations of a given standard hidden frame of that speaker. Based on this hypothesis, we train a model using self-supervised learning model such that it generates similar representations for frames from a given speaker. we then exploit the representations in a downstream model that performs clustering of the learned features using deep neural network. Formally this work seeks to answer the following questions:

1. Do the frames belonging to a speech of a given speaker contain enough information overlap to be considered augmentations of each other or they are disjoint ?
2. Does contrastive learning produce better node features as compared to graph convolutional neural network such that its features result in better clusters in downstream clustering task?
3. How does the reconstructed speech from established clusters compare with other existing state of the art speech separation techniques?

## 2 Related work

DNN speech separation models that are trained via supervised learning using time-frequency features employ a number of strategies to learn how to generate estimated clean signal from a noisy (mixed) signal. These strategies can be classified into two categories based on the target of the model: 1) direct estimate of clean speech features and 2) indirect estimation of clean signal features. Techniques that adopt direct estimate of clean speech features fit a nonlinear function to learn a mapping from a mixed signal feature to an estimated clean signal feature. The training datasets of these models consist of a noisy speech signal (source) and clean speech (target) features. This technique is used in [34] [35] [36] [37] [38] [39] [40] [41] [42] and [43]. Models that adopt indirect estimation of clean signal features estimate clean speech features by predicting real-valued or complex-valued masks [44]. The mask function is usually constrained to be in range the [0,1] even though different types of soft masks have been proposed ( see [18] [45] [46]). The masks are always established by computing the signal-to-noise (SNR) within each TF bin against a threshold or a local criterion [47]. It has been demonstrated experimentally that the use of masks significantly improves speech intelligibility when an original speech is composed of noise or a masker speech signal [48] [49]. For deep learning models working on the time-frequency domain, a model  $g_\theta$  is designed such that given a noisy spectrogram  $Y[t, n]$  at time frame  $t$ , it estimates the mask  $m_t$  at that time frame. The established mask  $m_t$  is then applied to the input spectrogram to estimate clean speech spectrogram i.e.  $\hat{S}_t = m_t \otimes Y[t, n]$ . Here,  $\hat{S}_t$  is the spectrogram estimate of the clean speech at time frame  $t$  and  $\otimes$  denotes element wise multiplication. To train the model  $g_\theta$ , there are two key objective variants. The first type minimizes an objective function  $D$  such as mean squared error (MSE) between the model estimated mask  $\hat{m}_m$  and the target mask ( $tm$ ).

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{u,t,f} D | tm_{u,t,f}, \hat{m}_{u,t,f} |$$

This approach however cannot effectively handle silences where  $|Y[t, n]| = 0$  and  $|X[t, n]| = 0$ , because the target masks  $tm$  will be undefined at the silences bins. Note that target masks such ideal amplitude mask involves division of  $|X[t, n]|$  and  $|Y[t, n]|$  hence silence regions will make the target mask undefined [18]. This cost function also focuses on minimizing the disparity between the masks instead of the features of estimated signal and the target clean signal [18]. The second type of cost function seeks to minimize the features of estimated signal  $\hat{S}_t = m_t \otimes Y[t, n]$  and those of target clean signal  $S$ .

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{u,t,f} D | \hat{m}_{u,t} Y_{u,t,f}, S_{u,t,f} |$$

The sum is over all the speech  $u$  and time-frequency bin  $(t, f)$ . Here,  $Y$  and  $S$  represents noisy and clean speech respectively. So, for DNN tools using indirect estimation of clean signal features, instead of them estimating the clean features directly from the noisy features input, the models first estimate binary masks. The binary masks are then applied to the noisy features to separate the sources (see figure 5, here, the features are the TF spectrogram). This technique has been applied in [1] [16] [41] [42] [45] [50] [51] [21] [52] [53] [54] [55] [14] [53] [27]. Due to the challenge of phase estimation when working in time-frequency domain, different models such as [56] [57] [8] [58] [59] [9] [60] [61][62] [63] [64] [65] explore the idea of designing a deep learning model for speech separation that accepts speech signal in the time-domain. The fundamental concept for these models is to replace the DFT based input with a data-driven representation that is jointly learned during model training. The models therefore accept as their input the mixed raw waveform sound and then generates either the estimated clean sources or masks that are applied on the noisy waveform to generate clean sources. By working on the raw waveform, these models address two key limitations of DFT based models. First, the models are designed to fully learn the magnitude and phase information of the input signal during training [57]. Secondly, they avoid reconstruction challenges faced when working with DFT features.

### 3 Contrastive deep modularization model (ConDeepMod)




Figure 1: The proposed framework for speech separation combining contrastive learning and deep modularizing Network

The goal of contrastive self-supervised learning is to establish a representation function  $f : x \mapsto R^d$  that maps augmentations to a  $d$ -dimensional vectors by ensuring that 'similar view' of augmentations are closer to each other as compared to those of random ones. The practise is to pick augmentations  $(x, x^+)$  that are obtained by passing a given input through two different augmentations functions. Essentially contrastive learning tries to make representations of a given input invariant to augmentations transformations [66]. Ideal augmentations of inputs are those that retain features of the inputs that are crucial in the intended task (e.g classification) but modify the features that are less important for that task. In our case we intend to use the different frames of a speech from given speaker to train a model to generate representations that can be used to identify that speaker in a downstream clustering model. We hypothesize that the different frames of a speech belonging to a given speaker qualify to be viewed as augmentations of a standard hidden frame of that speaker in the speech separation

domain. For frames of a given speaker to qualify as augmented versions of each other, they must retain important features for speaker’s speech identity and modify the less important ones. Voice pitch i.e the auditory perception of the rate of vocal fold vibration (the fundamental frequency or F0), is perhaps the most important acoustic cue of talker identity [67]. Other features that are exploited for speech separation include vocal timbre, speaking rate that reveal indexical characteristics can be used for talker identification. The question therefore is: do the different frames of speech from a given speaker contain enough amount of overlap on prosodic information (such as pitch and intensity) that are important to segregate the frames of that speaker when the frames are mixed with those from other speakers ?

To investigate this, we design a function  $f : X \mapsto R^d$  that maps frames to  $d$ -dimension vectors by encouraging representations of pairs of frames from a given speaker to be closer to each other as compared to representations of frames of another random speaker. Given,  $n$  speeches from  $n$  speakers, we chunk each speech into equally sized frames. Let  $\bar{X}$  denote the set of all frames generated from speeches from different speakers. Let the function  $\mathcal{S}(\cdot, \cdot | \bar{X})$  be viewed as augmentation pair generator such that it picks two pairs of frames from  $\bar{X}$  belonging to the same speaker i.e

$$(x_i, x_i^+) \sim \mathcal{D}_{pos} \equiv (x_i, x_i^+) \sim \text{i.i.d } \mathcal{S}(\cdot, \cdot | \bar{X}) \quad (3)$$

Here the pair  $(x_i, x_i^+)$  is the positive pair with distribution  $\mathcal{D}_{pos}$ . Given a batch size of  $n$ , for a positive pair  $(x_i, x_i^+)$ , we consider all the other  $n - 2$  to be the negative examples with a distribution of  $\mathcal{D}_{neg}$ . To train the model to fit the function  $f$ , we use adopt simCLR contrastive loss [68].

$$L(f) = \mathbb{E}_{x, x^+ \sim \mathcal{D}_{pos}, x_i^-, x_{i:n-2}^- \sim \mathcal{D}_{neg}} \left[ -\log \left( \frac{e^{f(x)^T f(x^+)}}{e^{f(x)^T f(x^+)} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} e^{f(x)^T f(x_i^-)}} \right) \right] \quad (4)$$

The loss function seeks to make the similarity  $f(x)f(x^+)$  larger as compared to  $f(x)f(x^-)$ . Once the model is trained to establish frame level features, we exploit the trained model in the downstream task.

**Downstream task:** We define a graph  $G(V, E)$  where  $V = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)$ ,  $|V| = n$  is the set of all nodes (frames) and  $E \subset V \times V$ ,  $|E| = m$  is the set of all edges. We denote adjacency matrix of  $G$  by  $A$  where  $A_{ij} = 1$  iff  $\{v_i, v_j\} \in E$  and 0 otherwise. The degree of  $v_i$  is defined as  $d_i = \sum_j^n A_{ij}$ , we are interested in generating graph partition function  $\mathcal{F} : V \rightarrow \{1, \dots, k\}$  that splits the set of nodes  $V$  into  $k$  partition  $v_i = \{v_j : \mathcal{F}(v_j) = i\}$  given the nodes attributes  $\bar{F} \in R^{n \times d}$  generated by contrastive learning. To construct the adjacency matrix  $A$ , for each node  $i$  we compute its similarity with all other nodes using inner product i.e

$$e_{ij} = \bar{f}_i^T \bar{f}_j \quad (5)$$

where  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$  and  $\bar{f}_i$  and  $\bar{f}_j \in \bar{F}$ . We then select a threshold  $\theta$  such that if  $e_{ij} < \theta$ , we remove an edge between  $i$  and  $j$  then the adjacency matrix is defined as

$$A_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if there is an edge between } i \text{ and } j \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

### 3.1 Deep modularity network

The downstream task seeks to cluster the frames of a mixed speech into  $k$  different clusters. Given the feature representations  $\bar{F}$  generated by contrastive learning, we need to partition the frame features into  $k$  partitions. We explore the idea of modularizing the learned features via deep neural network graph partition technique proposed in [69],[70]. They propose to partition nodes of a graph by the following formulation.

$$\bar{F} = \text{GNN}(\tilde{A}, X, \theta_{GNN}) \quad (7)$$

$$S = \text{softmax}(\bar{F}) \quad (8)$$

Where  $\tilde{A} = D^{-\frac{1}{2}} A D^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ ,  $X$  are the input features and  $D$  is the diagonal matrix with the degrees  $d_1, \dots, d_n$  on the diagonal. Node features  $\bar{F}$  are learned via graph neural network (GNN) and the assignment matrix  $S$  is established via softmax activation function. In [70], the assignment matrix  $S$  is established via multi-layer perceptron (MLP) with softmax on the output layer. In our case, we formulate the problem of clustering as

$$\bar{F} = \text{Con}(X, \theta_{con}) \quad (9)$$

$$S = \text{MLP}(\bar{F}, \theta_{mlp}) \quad (10)$$

The key difference being that our features are learned via contrastive learning(Con) then we establish assignment matrix  $S$  via MLP with softmax on the output layer.

### 3.2 Modularity background

Modularity ( $Q$ ) is defined according to equation 11 [71]

$$Q = \text{Number of edges within a community} - \text{expected number of such edges} \quad (11)$$

The expected number of edges involves choosing a null model against which to compare the performance of clustering. This is formulated in [71] as

$$Q = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{ij} (A_{ij} - P_{ij}) \delta(g_i, g_j) \quad (12)$$

where  $\delta(g_i, g_j)$  is 1 if vertex  $i$  and  $j$  belong to the same group and 0 otherwise.  $P_{ij}$  is the expected number of edges between  $i$  and  $j$  while  $A_{ij}$  is the actual number of edges between  $i$  and  $j$ . If vertex  $i$  and  $j$  have degrees  $d_i$  and  $d_j$  respectively then the expected degree of vertex  $i$  can be defined as  $\sum_j P_{ij} = d_i$ . Based on this, vertex  $i$  and  $j$  are connected with probability  $P_{ij} = \frac{d_i d_j}{2m}$  (see [71]). Hence equation 12 is modified to

$$Q = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{ij} (A_{ij} - \frac{d_i d_j}{2m}) \delta(g_i, g_j) \quad (13)$$

Modularity therefore entails maximizing  $Q$ . The problem of maximizing  $Q$  is NP-Hard [72], however by recasting the problem as spectral relaxation,  $Q$  can be solved efficiently. Let  $S \in (0, 1)^{N \times K}$  be a cluster assignment matrix such that  $S_{ij} = 1$  if node  $i$  belong to cluster  $j$  and 0 otherwise. The modularity matrix  $B$  is defined as  $A - \frac{dd^T}{2m}$ , hence modularity  $Q$  can now be defined as

$$Q = \frac{1}{2m} \text{Tr}(S^T B S) \quad (14)$$

By relaxing  $S \in R^{N \times K}$  the optimal  $S$  that maximizes  $Q$  is the top  $k$  eigenvectors of matrix  $B$ . A number of algorithms working on graph structure have been proposed to solve equation 14 efficiently(see [71]). Our approach however is to exploit the node features  $\bar{F} \in R^{n \times d}$  learned by contrastive learning and deep learning technique to establish optimal  $S$  that maximizes equation 14. Given  $\bar{F}$  the matrix of node (frames) established by contrastive learning, we compute cluster assignment of node using MLP with softmax on the output layers. This maps each node feature  $f_i \in \bar{F}$  into the  $i$  row of the cluster assignment matrix  $S$ . To optimize the assignment  $S$  we use the loss function in equation 15 [69]. The right side of equation 15 is composed of two factors i.e., the modularity and the collapse regularization. Collapse regularization is crucial to avoid  $S$  generating trivial clusters. Further, it has been demonstrated in [69] that the loss function in equation 15 maintains consistency of community detection as the number of nodes grows.

$$L(S) = -\frac{1}{2m} \text{Tr}(S^T B S) + \frac{\sqrt{k}}{n} \left\| \sum_i S_i^T \right\|_F - 1 \quad (15)$$

The complexity of  $\text{Tr}(S^T B S)$  is  $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$  per update of  $L(S)$  which is computationally costly. Therefore to efficiently update  $L(S)$ ,  $\text{Tr}(S^T B S)$  is decomposed into sum of sparse matrix-matrix multiplication and rank one degree normalization  $\text{Tr}(S A S - S d d^T S)$ . This reduces complexity to  $\mathcal{O}(d^2 n)$  for every update of the loss function.

### 3.3 Clean signal estimation

From the established  $k$  clusters established through modularization, we generate  $k$  masks in the range  $[0, 1]$ , where 0 signifies that a given frame in the input mixed signal is missing in that cluster while 1 signifies presence of a given frame. The mask based separation of sources is predicated on the assumption of sparsity and orthogonality of the sources in the mixed signal in the domain in which masks are being computed. Based on this assumption, the dominant signal at a given range is taken to be only signal at that range. Therefore, generation of clusters through modularization is to estimate dominant signals at a given range. Once the masks have been established, they are applied on the input mixed signal to generate  $k$  estimated clean signals.

### 3.4 Model(f)

The model (encoder)  $f$  which is used to establish frame representations is made up of a stack of 6 identical layers. One such layer is shown in figure 2. The layers are composed of layer normalization, 1D convolution and 1D maxpooling.




Figure 2: The proposed Encoder, where  $\text{Conv1D}(x,y,z)$  represents a 1D convolution with  $filters = x$ , kernel size =  $y$  and  $strides = z$ .  $\text{MaxPool}(x,y)$  is a 1D maxpooling with  $poolsize = x$  and  $strides = y$

## 4 Experiments

### 4.1 Dataset

To pre-train the model to generate frame level embeddings, we use the popular Wall Street Journal (WSJ0) corpus and the AudioMNIST dataset [73]. For WSJ0 dataset, we use training set while for AudioMNIST we use the whole dataset. AudioMNIST dataset consists of 30,000 audio recordings of spoken digits (0-9). Each digit is repeated 50 times for 60 different speakers. Given an audio we generate frames of size 256 i.e. for an audio sampled at 8kHz, a frame of 32ms is generated with a stride size of 8ms. We use Adam optimizer and use cyclical learning rate [74] with a minimum learning rate of  $1e - 4$  and a maximum of  $1e - 1$ . For downstream task, we use wsj0-2mix and wsj0-3mix [10]. These datasets are made of two-speaker and three-speaker mixtures respectively created from the Wall Street Journal (WSJ0) corpus. The datasets are created by exploiting randomly selected gains in order to achieve relative levels between 0 and 5 dB between the two and three speech signals. The datasets are composed of 30 h training, 10 h validation, and 5 h test sets. The training, validation and test sets are composed of 20,000, 5,000 and 3,000 instantaneous two-speaker mixtures respectively. The training and validation sets share common speakers, which is not the case for test set. The speeches are sampled at 8 kHz. In our case, we use the training and validation dataset to fine-tune the pre-trained model and test dataset is exploited to evaluate the ability of the model to generate clean speeches.

### 4.2 Quality of clusters

To begin our experiments, we first evaluate if the established frames (nodes) features via contrastive learning technique can generate quality clusters when MLP is exploited downstream to generate clusters. The loss used to train MLP to generate clusters is shown in equation 15. To evaluate the quality of clusters, after fine tuning the pre-trained model using the training and validation set of wsj0-2mix, we use its test set for cluster generation. Graph-based clustering metrics [75] is adopted for measuring cluster quality

#### 1. Cluster conductance (C)

$$f(S) = \frac{c_s}{2m_s + c_s} \quad (16)$$

where  $S$  is a set of nodes, the function  $f(S)$  measures the quality of clusters in the nodes of  $S$ ,  $m_s$  is the number of edges in  $S$  i.e  $m_s = \{(u, v) \in E, u \in S, v \in S\}$  and  $c_s$  is the number of edges in the boundary of  $S$  i.e.  $c_s = \{(u, v) \in E : u \in S, v \notin S\}$

## 2. Graph modularity ( $\mathcal{Q}$ )

$$f(S) = \frac{1}{4}(m_s - E(m_s)) \quad (17)$$

where  $E(m_s)$  is the expected  $m_s$ .

We compare the results with those produced by technique proposed in [69], where graph convolution neural network (GCN) is used to generate node features and MLP is used to derive clusters see equation 7 and 8. We replace the softmax with MLP to enable direct comparison. Basically, we are comparing the quality of node features generated via GCN and contrastive learning in generating quality clusters. For GCN, we use one hidden layer with 512 neurons the same parameters are used in [69]. When training both models using the loss function in equation 15, the maximum number of clusters is set to 16. The results in presented in table 1. We multiply the  $f(S)$  of the two metrics by 100 for easy readability. The proposed technique establishes clusters with C of 5.4 and  $\mathcal{Q}$  of 86.2 as compared to those of GCN+MLP of 11.2 and 76.8 respectively. This is an indication that for these settings, the proposed model for contrastive learning produces superior quality features as opposed to GCN.

Table 1: Results of the two technique based on graph conductance C and modularity Q.

Technique	C	$\mathcal{Q}$
Contrastive learning +MLP	5.4	86.2
GCN+MLP	11.2	76.8

## 5 Are the different frames of a given speaker augmented versions of a hidden standard frame of that speaker ?

Here, we evaluate if any two augmentations of the same speech have enough overlap i.e they are not disjoint.

**Definition 1:** *Frames are said to be disjoint if for all distinct augmentation selections  $(x_i, x_i^+)$  and  $(x_j, x_j^+)$  generated by augmentation selection function  $S(., . | \bar{X})$ ,  $(x_i, x_i^+)$  and  $(x_j, x_j^+)$  have a disjoint support.*

A typical way to demonstrate that frames are disjoint is when there exist a global minimizer of contrastive loss with a vacuous transfer on a downstream task for representation dimension that is small compared to the size of the input space [66]. To check if the frames of a given speaker are disjoint, we evaluate the performance of representations generated with different contrastive losses on quality of clusters produced. The results in shown in table 2. From the results in table 2, contrastive loss has monotonic effect on both graph conductance and modularity metrics signalling that the augmentations have some overlap hence do not generate spurious representations.

Table 2: Results of the two technique based on graph conductance C and modularity Q.

Contrastive loss	C	$\mathcal{Q}$
5.62	57.3	18.2
5.32	57.2	17.3
5.0	62.4	15.3
4.9	64.9	11.4
4.6	64.9	11.4
4.3	76.7	8.4
3.7	86.5	5.4



## 6 Sources separation results

We evaluated the performance of the proposed technique based on contrastive learning and deep modularization(ConDeepMod) on source separation on both wsj0-2mix and wsj0-3mix test dataset. Table 3 reports the results based on the evaluation metrics of SI-SNR improvement (SISNRi) and Signal-to-Distortion Ratio improvement (SDRi). Further, we compare the results of ConDeepMod with other state of the art techniques on speech separation. On WSJ0-2mix test-dataset, ConDeepMod attains an SI-SNRi of 20.8 and SDRi of 21.0. It performs slightly lower than the two versions of wavesplit and SepFormer. The strength of the proposed technique is demonstrated as number of sources is increased. In WSJ0-3mix test-dataset, it outperforms all the tools in both metrics. While other tools register lower performance as compared to wsj0-2mix, ConDeepMod even registers a slight improvement in performance. This shows that the proposed technique using modularization is able to scale well with increased number of sources in the mixed signal.

Table 3: Evaluation results of speech separation tools.

Results on the WSJ0-2mix test-dataset			
Model	SI-SNRi	SDRi	parameters
SepFormer	20.4	20.5	26
SepFormer+DM	22.3	22.4	26
Wavesplit	21.0	21.2	29
Wavesplit+DM	22.2	22.3	29
DeepCASA	17.7	18.0	12.8
ConvTasnet	15.3	15.6	5.1
ConDeepMod	20.8	21.0	2.1
Results on the WSJ0-3mix test-dataset			
SepFormer	17.6	17.9	26
SepFormer+DM	19.5	19.7	26
Wavesplit	17.3	17.6	29
Wavesplit+DM	17.8	18.1	29
ConvTasnet	12.7	13.1	5.1
ConDeepMod	20.6	20.7	2.1

## 7 Limitations

This work has not investigated the performance of the proposed technique when a mixed speech has noisy and reverberation. Further we did not evaluate the impact of varying frame size on the performance of the proposed tool.

## 8 Conclusion

In this work we demonstrate that for speech separation task, the different frames of a given speech belonging to a given individual can be viewed as augmentations of each other. The different frames contain enough overlap on prosodic information which is key in speech separation. We exploit this fact to implement a fully supervised technique which can achieve high quality estimated clean speech from a mixed one. Moreover, the proposed technique is competitive with the supervised based state of the art techniques.

## References

- [1] Y. Wang and D. L. Wang, "Towards scaling up classification-based speech separation," *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech and Language Processing*, vol. 21, no. 7, pp. 1381–1390, 2013.
- [2] Y. Wang, A. Narayanan, and D. L. Wang, "On training targets for supervised speech separation," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio Speech and Language Processing*, vol. 22, no. 12, pp. 1849–1858, 2014.
- [3] M. N. Schmidt and R. K. Olsson, "Single-channel speech separation using sparse non-negative matrix factorization," *INTERSPEECH 2006 and 9th International Conference on Spoken Language Processing, INTERSPEECH 2006 - ICSLP*, vol. 5, pp. 2614–2617, 2006.

- [4] Z. Wang and F. Sha, “DISCRIMINATIVE NON-NEGATIVE MATRIX FACTORIZATION FOR SINGLE-CHANNEL SPEECH SEPARATION Zi Wang Department of Computer Science and Technology Tsinghua University Department of Computer Science University of Southern California Los Angeles , CA 90089,” *2014 IEEE International Conference on Acoustic, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pp. 3777–3781, 2014. [Online]. Available: <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/854a/454106bd42a8bca158426d8b12b48ba0cae8.pdf>
- [5] T. Virtanen and A. T. Cemgil, “Mixtures of gamma priors for non-negative matrix factorization based speech separation,” *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*, vol. 5441, no. 3, pp. 646–653, 2009.
- [6] T. Virtanen, “Speech recognition using factorial hidden Markov models for separation in the feature space,” *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, INTERSPEECH*, vol. 1, pp. 89–92, 2006.
- [7] Y. Shao and D. Wang, “Model-based sequential organization in cochannel speech,” *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech and Language Processing*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 289–298, 2006.
- [8] Y. Luo and N. Mesgarani, “Conv-TasNet: Surpassing Ideal Time-Frequency Magnitude Masking for Speech Separation,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio Speech and Language Processing*, vol. 27, no. 8, pp. 1256–1266, 2019.
- [9] C. Subakan, M. Ravanelli, S. Cornell, M. Bronzi, and J. Zhong, “Attention is all you need in speech separation,” *ICASSP, IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing - Proceedings*, vol. 2021-June, pp. 21–25, 2021.
- [10] J. R. Hershey, Z. Chen, J. Le Roux, and S. Watanabe, “Deep clustering: Discriminative embeddings for segmentation and separation,” *ICASSP, IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing - Proceedings*, vol. 2016-May, pp. 31–35, 2016.
- [11] Y. Wang, J. Du, L. R. Dai, and C. H. Lee, “A gender mixture detection approach to unsupervised single-channel speech separation based on deep neural networks,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio Speech and Language Processing*, vol. 25, no. 7, pp. 1535–1546, 2017.
- [12] —, “Unsupervised single-channel speech separation via deep neural network for different gender mixtures,” *2016 Asia-Pacific Signal and Information Processing Association Annual Summit and Conference, APSIPA 2016*, 2017.
- [13] N. Zeghidour and D. Grangier, “Wavesplit: End-to-End Speech Separation by Speaker Clustering,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio Speech and Language Processing*, vol. 29, no. iv, pp. 2840–2849, 2021.
- [14] P.-S. Huang, M. Kim, M. Hasegawa-Johnson, and P. Smaragdis, “DEEP LEARNING FOR MONAURAL SPEECH SEPARATION,” *Acta Physica Polonica B*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 33–44, 2011.
- [15] C. Weng, D. Yu, M. L. Seltzer, and J. Droppo, “Deep neural networks for single-channel multi-talker speech recognition,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio Speech and Language Processing*, vol. 23, no. 10, pp. 1670–1679, 2015.
- [16] Y. Isik, J. Le Roux, Z. Chen, S. Watanabe, and J. R. Hershey, “Single-channel multi-speaker separation using deep clustering,” *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, INTERSPEECH*, vol. 08-12-Sept, pp. 545–549, 2016.
- [17] D. Yu, M. Kolbaek, Z. H. Tan, and J. Jensen, “Permutation invariant training of deep models for speaker-independent multi-talker speech separation,” *ICASSP, IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing - Proceedings*, pp. 241–245, 2017.
- [18] M. Kolbæk, D. Yu, Z. H. Tan, and J. Jensen, “Multitalker Speech Separation With Utterance-Level Permutation Invariant Training of Deep Recurrent Neural Networks,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio Speech and Language Processing*, vol. 25, no. 10, pp. 1901–1913, 2017.

- [19] H. Tachibana, “Towards listening to 10 people simultaneously: An efficient permutation invariant training of audio source separation using Sinkhorn’s algorithm,” *ICASSP, IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing - Proceedings*, vol. 2021-June, pp. 491–495, 2021.
- [20] S. Dovrat, E. Nachmani, and L. Wolf, “Many-speakers single channel speech separation with optimal permutation training,” *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, INTERSPEECH*, vol. 4, pp. 2408–2412, 2021.
- [21] J. R. Hershey, Z. Chen, J. L. Roux, and S. Watanabe, “DEEP CLUSTERING : DISCRIMINATIVE EMBEDDINGS FOR SEGMENTATION AND SEPARATION Mitsubishi Electric Research Laboratories ( MERL ), Cambridge , MA 02139 , USA,” *ICASSP, IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing - Proceedings*, pp. 31–35, 2016.
- [22] J. Byun and J. W. Shin, “Monaural speech separation using speaker embedding from preliminary separation,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio Speech and Language Processing*, vol. 29, pp. 2753–2763, 2021.
- [23] S. Qin, T. Jiang, S. Wu, N. Wang, and X. Zhao, “Graph convolution-based deep clustering for speech separation,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 82 571–82 580, 2020.
- [24] J. H. Lee, J. H. Chang, J. M. Yang, and H. G. Moon, “NAS-TasNet: Neural Architecture Search for Time-Domain Speech Separation,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 10, pp. 56 031–56 043, 2022.
- [25] F. Jiang and Z. Duan, “Speaker attractor network: Generalizing speech separation to unseen numbers of sources,” *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 27, pp. 1859–1863, 2020.
- [26] E. Nachmani, Y. Adi, and L. Wolf, “Voice separation with an unknown number of multiple speakers,” *37th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2020*, vol. PartF16814, pp. 7121–7132, 2020.
- [27] Y. Liu and D. Wang, “Divide and Conquer: A Deep CASA Approach to Talker-Independent Monaural Speaker Separation,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio Speech and Language Processing*, vol. 27, no. 12, pp. 2092–2102, 2019.
- [28] Y. Luo and N. Mesgarani, “Separating varying numbers of sources with auxiliary autoencoding loss,” *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, INTERSPEECH*, vol. 2020-October, pp. 2622–2626, 2020.
- [29] J. Shi, J. Xu, G. Liu, and B. Xu, “Listen, think and listen again: Capturing top-down auditory attention for speaker-independent speech separation,” *IJCAI International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 2018-July, pp. 4353–4360, 2018.
- [30] K. Kinoshita, L. Drude, M. Delcroix, and T. Nakatani, “Listening to each speaker one by one with recurrent selective hearing networks,” *ICASSP, IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing - Proceedings*, vol. 2018-April, pp. 5064–5068, 2018.
- [31] N. Takahashi, S. Parthasarathy, N. Goswami, and Y. Mitsufuji, “Recursive speech separation for unknown number of speakers,” *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, INTERSPEECH*, vol. 2019-September, pp. 1348–1352, 2019.
- [32] T. V. Neumann, K. Kinoshita, M. Delcroix, S. Araki, T. Nakatani, and R. Haeb-Umbach, “All-neural Online Source Separation, Counting, and Diarization for Meeting Analysis,” *ICASSP, IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing - Proceedings*, vol. 2019-May, pp. 91–95, 2019.
- [33] T. von Neumann, C. Boeddeker, L. Drude, K. Kinoshita, M. Delcroix, T. Nakatani, and R. Haeb-Umbach, “Multi-talker ASR for an unknown number of sources: Joint training of source counting, separation and ASR,” *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, INTERSPEECH*, vol. 2020-October, pp. 3097–3101, 2020.

- [34] S. W. Fu, T. W. Wang, Y. Tsao, X. Lu, H. Kawai, D. Stoller, S. Ewert, S. Dixon, X. Lu, Y. Tsao, S. Matsuda, C. Hori, Y. Xu, J. Du, L. R. Dai, C. H. Lee, T. Gao, J. Du, L. R. Dai, C. H. Lee, S. W. Fu, Y. Tsao, X. Lu, F. Weninger, J. R. Hershey, J. Le Roux, B. Schuller, Y. Xu, J. Du, L. R. Dai, C. H. Lee, F. Lluís, J. Pons, and X. Serra, “Speech enhancement based on deep denoising autoencoder,” *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, INTERSPEECH*, vol. 08-12-Sept, no. 1, pp. 7–19, 2018.
- [35] E. M. Grais and M. D. Plumbley, “Single channel audio source separation using convolutional denoising autoencoders,” *2017 IEEE Global Conference on Signal and Information Processing, GlobalSIP 2017 - Proceedings*, vol. 2018-Janua, pp. 1265–1269, 2018.
- [36] A. Jansson, E. Humphrey, N. Montecchio, R. Bittner, A. Kumar, and T. Weyde, “Singing voice separation with deep U-Net convolutional networks,” *Proceedings of the 18th International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference, ISMIR 2017*, pp. 745–751, 2017.
- [37] M. Kim and P. Smaragdis, “Adaptive denoising autoencoders: A fine-tuning scheme to learn from test mixtures,” *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*, vol. 9237, pp. 100–107, 2015.
- [38] Y. Xu, J. Du, L. R. Dai, and C. H. Lee, “A regression approach to speech enhancement based on deep neural networks,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio Speech and Language Processing*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 7–19, 2015.
- [39] X. Lu, Y. Tsao, S. Matsuda, and C. Hori, “Speech enhancement based on deep denoising autoencoder,” *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, INTERSPEECH*, no. August, pp. 436–440, 2013.
- [40] Y. Xu, J. Du, L. R. Dai, and C. H. Lee, “An experimental study on speech enhancement based on deep neural networks,” *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 65–68, 2014.
- [41] F. Weninger, J. R. Hershey, J. Le Roux, and B. Schuller, “Discriminatively trained recurrent neural networks for single-channel speech separation,” *2014 IEEE Global Conference on Signal and Information Processing, GlobalSIP 2014*, pp. 577–581, 2014.
- [42] S. W. Fu, Y. Tsao, and X. Lu, “SNR-aware convolutional neural network modeling for speech enhancement,” *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, INTERSPEECH*, vol. 08-12-Sept, pp. 3768–3772, 2016.
- [43] T. Gao, J. Du, L. R. Dai, and C. H. Lee, “SNR-based progressive learning of deep neural network for speech enhancement,” *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, INTERSPEECH*, vol. 08-12-Sept, pp. 3713–3717, 2016.
- [44] D. S. Williamson and D. L. Wang, “Time-frequency masking in the complex domain for speech dereverberation and denoising,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio Speech and Language Processing*, vol. 25, no. 7, pp. 1492–1501, 2017.
- [45] A. Narayanan and D. Wang, “IDEAL RATIO MASK ESTIMATION USING DEEP NEURAL NETWORKS FOR ROBUST SPEECH RECOGNITION Arun Narayanan and DeLiang Wang Department of Computer Science and Engineering Center for Cognitive Science The Ohio State University,” *2013 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, pp. 7092–7096, 2013.
- [46] H. Erdogan, J. R. Hershey, S. Watanabe, and J. Le Roux, “Phase-sensitive and recognition-boosted speech separation using deep recurrent neural networks,” *ICASSP, IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing - Proceedings*, vol. 2015-Augus, pp. 708–712, 2015.
- [47] U. Kjems, J. B. Boldt, M. S. Pedersen, T. Lunner, and D. Wang, “Role of mask pattern in intelligibility of ideal binary-masked noisy speech,” *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, vol. 126, no. 3, pp. 1415–1426, 2009.
- [48] D. S. Brungart, P. S. Chang, B. D. Simpson, and D. Wang, “Isolating the energetic component of speech-on-speech masking with ideal time-frequency segregation,” pp. 4007–4018, 2006.

- [49] S. A. Nossier, J. Wall, M. Moniri, C. Glackin, and N. Cannings, “A Comparative Study of Time and Frequency Domain Approaches to Deep Learning based Speech Enhancement,” *Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Neural Networks*, 2020.
- [50] Z. Chen, S. Watanabe, H. Erdogan, and J. R. Hershey, “Speech enhancement and recognition using multi-task learning of long short-term memory recurrent neural networks,” in *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, INTER-SPEECH*, vol. 2015-Janua, 2015, pp. 3274–3278.
- [51] P. S. Huang, M. Kim, M. Hasegawa-Johnson, and P. Smaragdis, “Joint Optimization of Masks and Deep Recurrent Neural Networks for Monaural Source Separation,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio Speech and Language Processing*, vol. 23, no. 12, pp. 2136–2147, 2015.
- [52] E. M. Grais, M. U. Sen, and H. Erdogan, “Deep neural networks for single channel source separation,” *ICASSP, IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing - Proceedings*, pp. 3734–3738, 2014.
- [53] X. L. Zhang and D. Wang, “A deep ensemble learning method for monaural speech separation,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio Speech and Language Processing*, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 967–977, 2016.
- [54] A. Narayanan and D. Wang, “Improving robustness of deep neural network acoustic models via speech separation and joint adaptive training,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio Speech and Language Processing*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 92–101, 2015.
- [55] F. Weninger, H. Erdogan, S. Watanabe, E. Vincent, J. Le Roux, J. R. Hershey, and B. Schuller, “Speech enhancement with LSTM recurrent neural networks and its application to noise-robust ASR,” *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*, vol. 9237, pp. 91–99, 2015.
- [56] Y. Luo and N. Mesgarani, “TaSNet: Time-Domain Audio Separation Network for Real-Time, Single-Channel Speech Separation,” *ICASSP, IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing - Proceedings*, vol. 2018-April, pp. 696–700, 2018.
- [57] Y. Luo, Z. Chen, and T. Yoshioka, “Dual-Path RNN: Efficient Long Sequence Modeling for Time-Domain Single-Channel Speech Separation,” *ICASSP, IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing - Proceedings*, vol. 2020-May, pp. 46–50, 2020.
- [58] S. Venkataramani, J. Casebeer, and P. Smaragdis, “END-TO-END SOURCE SEPARATION WITH ADAPTIVE FRONT-ENDS University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign Adobe Research,” *2018 52nd Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems, and Computers*, no. 1, pp. 684–688, 2018.
- [59] L. Zhang, Z. Shi, J. Han, A. Shi, and D. Ma, “FurcaNeXt: End-to-end monaural speech separation with dynamic gated dilated temporal convolutional networks,” *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*, vol. 11961 LNCS, pp. 653–665, 2020.
- [60] E. Tzinis, S. Venkataramani, Z. Wang, C. Subakan, and P. Smaragdis, “Two-Step Sound Source Separation: Training on Learned Latent Targets,” *ICASSP, IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing - Proceedings*, vol. 2020-May, pp. 31–35, 2020.
- [61] E. Tzinis, Z. Wang, and P. Smaragdis, “Sudo RM -RF: Efficient networks for universal audio source separation,” *IEEE International Workshop on Machine Learning for Signal Processing, MLSP*, vol. 2020-Sept, 2020.
- [62] Z. Kong, W. Ping, A. Dantrey, and B. Catanzaro, “Speech Denoising in the Waveform Domain With Self-Attention,” *ICASSP, IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing - Proceedings*, vol. 2022-May, pp. 7867–7871, 2022.
- [63] J. Su, Z. Jin, and A. Finkelstein, “HiFi-GAN: High-fidelity denoising and dereverberation based on speech deep features in adversarial networks,” *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, INTERSPEECH*, vol. 2020-October, no. 3, pp. 4506–4510, 2020.

- [64] M. W. Lam, J. Wang, D. Su, and D. Yuy, “Sandglassnet: A Light Multi-Granularity Self-Attentive Network for Time-Domain Speech Separation,” *ICASSP, IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing - Proceedings*, vol. 2021-June, pp. 5759–5763, 2021.
- [65] M. W. Lam, J. Wang, D. Su, and D. Yu, “Effective Low-Cost Time-Domain Audio Separation Using Globally Attentive Locally Recurrent Networks,” *2021 IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop, SLT 2021 - Proceedings*, pp. 801–808, 2021.
- [66] N. Saunshi, J. Ash, S. Goel, D. Misra, C. Zhang, S. Arora, S. Kakade, and A. Krishnamurthy, “Understanding contrastive learning requires incorporating inductive biases,” 2 2022. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2202.14037>
- [67] X. Xie and E. Myers, “The impact of musical training and tone language experience on talker identification,” *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, vol. 137, pp. 419–432, 1 2015.
- [68] T. Chen, S. Kornblith, M. Norouzi, and G. Hinton, “A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations,” 2 2020. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2002.05709>
- [69] A. Tsitsulin, J. Palowitch, B. Perozzi, and E. Müller, “Graph clustering with graph neural networks,” 6 2020. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2006.16904>
- [70] F. M. Bianchi, D. Grattarola, and C. Alippi, “Spectral clustering with graph neural networks for graph pooling,” 2020.
- [71] M. E. Newman, “Finding community structure in networks using the eigenvectors of matrices,” *Physical Review E - Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics*, vol. 74, 2006.
- [72] U. Brandes, D. Delling, M. Gaertler, R. Görke, M. Hofer, Z. Nikoloski, and D. Wagner, “Maximizing modularity is hard,” 2006.
- [73] S. Becker, M. Ackermann, S. Lopuschkin, K.-R. Müller, and W. Samek, “Interpreting and explaining deep neural networks for classification of audio signals,” 7 2018. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1807.03418>
- [74] L. N. Smith, “Cyclical learning rates for training neural networks,” 6 2015. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1506.01186>
- [75] J. Yang and J. Leskovec, “Defining and evaluating network communities based on ground-truth,” 5 2012. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1205.6233>