

# Towards Solving Cocktail-Party: The First Method to Build a Realistic Dataset with Ground Truths for Speech Separation

Rawad Melhem<sup>\*1</sup>, Assef Jafar<sup>1</sup> and Oumayma Al Dakkak<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>(Higher Institute for Applied Sciences and Technology, Damascus, Syria)

## Abstract

Speech separation is very important in real-world applications such as human-machine interaction, hearing aids devices, and automatic meeting transcription. In recent years, a significant improvement occurred towards the solution based on deep learning. In fact, much attention has been drawn to supervised learning methods using synthetic mixtures datasets despite their being not representative of real-world mixtures. The difficulty in building a realistic dataset led researchers to use unsupervised learning methods, because of their ability to handle realistic mixtures directly. The results of unsupervised learning methods are still unconvincing. In this paper, a method is introduced to create a realistic dataset with ground truth sources for speech separation. The main challenge in designing a realistic dataset is the unavailability of ground truths for speakers' signals. To address this, we propose a method for simultaneously recording two speakers and obtaining the ground truth for each. We present a methodology for benchmarking our realistic dataset using a deep learning model based on Bidirectional Gated Recurrent Units (BGRU) and clustering algorithm. The experiments show that our proposed dataset improved SI-SDR (Scale Invariant Signal to Distortion Ratio) by 1.65 dB and PESQ (Perceptual Evaluation of Speech Quality) by approximately 0.5. We also evaluated the effectiveness of our method at different distances between the microphone and the speakers, and found that it improved the stability of the learned model.

**Keywords:** Single Channel, Speech Separation, Deep Learning, Realistic Datasets, Ground Truths.

## 1. Introduction

Cocktail Party problem was first raised more than half a century ago [1]; the required solution is to separate the individual speech signals of different speakers from a mixture of multiple speakers using a single channel in a realistic environment. During the last years, several deep learning models were proposed to improve the accuracy of separation and a great improvement has been achieved. First, supervised learning methods have been widely used to propose solutions, some of them addressed the problem in Time-Frequency domain, as in [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8], and others in Time-domain, as in [9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14] using clean synthetic dataset WSJ0\_2mix [2]. This dataset contains clean, synthetic, read speech and near-field utterances. Researchers obtained very good results with the previous methods; where SI-SDR reached 23.4 dB in [8], and PESQ reached 3.51 in [15]. However, these results were obtained in the same conditions in which the models were trained on (ideal clean instantaneous mixing). Unfortunately, the performance of these models tends to degrade in realistic experiments [16].

Second, some researchers tried to make the training dataset more similar to the reality. As in deep learning, the more similar the training data to reality is, the more accurate the learned model is; noisy synthetic mixtures were made, where the noise was added either mathematically to the clean speaker signal like WHAM! [17], WHAMR! [18], and LibriMix [19], or recorded along with the speaker signal to create a more realistic scenario like CHiME-3 [20], CHiME-5 [21], Mixer6 [22], and VoxCeleb [23], then the noisy synthetic mixtures would be created by adding the

---

\*Corresponding author.

E-mails: rawad.melhem@hiast.edu.sy (Rawad Melhem), assef.jafar@hiast.edu.sy (Assef Jafar), oumayma.dakkak@hiast.edu.sy (Oumayma Al Dakkak)

noisy recorded speakers signals together mathematically (sample to sample). In [24], the authors show through experiments that training on noisy oracle sources can lead to significant improvements in speech separation performance, particularly in noisy environments where traditional methods may not perform well. REAL-M is introduced in [16] as a realistic dataset for speech separation, utterances are collected by asking contributors to read predefined sentences from LibriSpeech [25] dataset simultaneously in different acoustic environments using different recording devices to reflect the real-world scenarios. REAL-M is a real life dataset but without ground truths, therefore it can only be used in unsupervised learning methods.

Indeed, adding two speakers' signals mathematically differs from real-world mixture, the primary challenge in creating a realistic dataset for speech separation is obtaining ground truth sources for each speaker, since it is impossible to record the same sound from the same speaker twice, they will certainly differ in amplitude, frequency, and duration. That is why recording two speakers simultaneously then recording each speaker alone will not give an accurate ground truth for training.

The unavailability of the realistic datasets spurred the researchers to think of unsupervised learning methods, by directly handling realistic mixtures. Yannan Wang et al. propose an unsupervised single-channel speech separation approach in [26] using a deep neural network to predict the gender of the speakers in the mixture and then separate the speech signals based on their predicted gender. The authors show that the use of gender information can improve the accuracy of speech separation. In [27], Kohei Saijo et al. introduce a new unsupervised speech separation algorithm that uses a cycle-consistent adversarial training approach to improve accuracy and stability; the used loss function leads to an explicit reduction in the distortions. The authors in [28] offer an unsupervised method for speech separation, Mixture Invariant Training (MixIT) which uses mixture of mixtures (MoM) as an input and separate them into variable number of latent sources, then remix them to make the original mixtures. This method suffers from over-separation problem. Teacher-Student framework is used in [29] to address the over-separation problem, where teacher model is trained using mixture of mixtures and MixIT, then the separated sources produced by teacher model are used as pseudo-targets to train student model using permutation invariant training (PIT) [7]. In [30], a new adaptation technique for unsupervised speech separation is proposed, that uses heterogeneous neural networks to produce high confidence pseudo labels of unlabeled real speech mixtures, then these labels are updated iteratively and used to refine the neural networks to produce more reliable pseudo labels for real mixture. This framework outperformed the previous unsupervised methods, but there remain some errors in pseudo labels that need to be removed in the future. Unsupervised speech separation is still a challenging open problem, and requires hard efforts to improve the accuracy.

So far, all the training datasets for speech separation with or without noise are synthetic or instantaneous. This means the mixture signal is artificial and is made using the digital addition (mathematic sum) of signals. Synthetic mixture differs from the realistic one which is the main reason behind performance degradation of models trained on synthetic datasets. In this paper, we introduce a method to build a realistic dataset with an acquisition of ground truth for each speaker; we deploy the method using TIMIT corpus utterances to create *Realistic\_TIMIT\_2mix*. The proposed algorithm depends on playing and recording an audio file simultaneously using MATLAB function *AudioPlayerRecorder* (APR). We apply APR for each speaker file alone to get ground truth for each speaker, then we apply APR for the two audio files, one on the left channel and the other on the right channel of the audio output device, and recording them (to get the mixture signal) using a microphone while playing the signals.

To evaluate *Realistic\_TIMIT\_2mix*, we applied the following methodology. First, we created a synthetic dataset *Synthetic\_TIMIT\_2mix* using the same files of *Realistic\_TIMIT\_2mix* where every realistic mixture is mapped into a synthetic mixture from the same both speakers. Second, we trained two copies of a base model for speech separation, one on *Realistic\_TIMIT\_2mix* and the other on *Synthetic\_TIMIT\_2mix*. Third, we compared the results using SI-SDR and PESQ metrics. Forth, we measured the performance of two models on different distances between the microphone and the speakers. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first realistic training dataset with ground truths for single-channel speech separation.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 explains the technique used. The proposed method is introduced in section 3. Section 4 demonstrates the effectiveness of our method through experiments. Section 5 presents the results and analysis. Finally, the paper is concluded in section 6.

## 2. AudioPlayerRecorder

Mathworks corporation introduced an object in R2017a version of MATLAB software called *AudioPlayerRecorder* (APR), which uses a full duplex sound device to read and write audio samples simultaneously in real time. Figure 1 (from MATLAB help documentation) demonstrates the way APR controls sound device. It needs exclusively ASIO (Audio Stream Input/Output) driver for sound device for windows operating system, since it provides low latency of recording. This driver bridges between MATLAB software and the sound card of the PC. In our algorithm we need full duplex sound card which has two buffers one for storing data coming from microphone and the other for storing data to be sent to the audio output device. The synchronization of rendering and recording audio files is considerable, so if the synchronization is lost, MATLAB returns the number of lost samples. Two cases may occur, overrun and underrun.

Overrun case: it happens during the recording operation, when the input buffer of the sound card is full, in this case new samples of the input signal are dropped.

Underrun case: it happens during the playing of audio file when the output buffer is empty, because the MATLAB algorithm doesn't supply samples to be played, so the output signal in this case is silence.

These two cases will be avoided in our algorithm, APR returns the number of overrun and underrun lost samples, if they are bigger than zero the APR will be rerun.

Another kind of synchronization must be achieved, the synchronization between left and right channels. Playing two




Figure 1. The interaction between APR and the full duplex sound card

different audio files on dual channels must be at the same time without any delay, because any shift between the playing of the two files will make errors in the recording of the dataset. In our work, the sound card driver supports multichannel audio playback, so the audio data for each channel is stored in a separate section of the output buffer, and both channels are connected with DAC (Digital to Analog Converter) with a sampling rate of 192KHz. This sampling rate is very high compared to the sampling rate of audio files, and hence minimizes the time shift between left and right channels. To make sure that time shift is very small between both channels; we measured it by a *BK Precision 2566-MSO* Oscilloscope (with sampling rate of 2GS/s). It showed no delay between the channels.

## 3. Proposed Method

The synthetic mixture signal or the instantaneous mixing of  $C$  signals can be defined by equation 1:

$$X_s = \sum_{k=1}^C s_k \quad (1)$$

Where  $s_k$  is the  $k$ -th speaker signal.  $C$  is the total number of speakers, and  $X_s$  is the synthetic mixture signal. In real world the mixture signal  $X_r$  is more complicated. It can be formulated as the result of application of nonlinear time-varying function  $\mathcal{H}$  on the speakers' signals, as is written in equation 2 ,

$$X_r = \mathcal{H}(s_1, \dots, s_C) \quad (2)$$

$\mathcal{H}$  is usually approximated by the sum of convolution multiplication of each speech signal with the corresponding impulse response of the recording room [31]. However, in reality, it is much more complicated than that, because the impulse response itself is an approximation of the channel between the speaker and the microphone, and it is affected by many factors such as noise, wind, locations of speakers, nonlinearity of the microphone, and interference, etc.

In this paper, we directly record  $X_r$  by a MATLAB function called *AudioPlayerRecorder (APR)* that renders and records audio files simultaneously. The proposed algorithm depends on playing two audio files simultaneously, one on the left channel and the other on the right channel of the audio output device, and recording them at the same time to get the mixture signal. The synchronization issue is very important here, we must run the two audio files and record them at the same time. Any error in the synchronization will cause an error in the alignment of the played files and the corresponding recorded file (mixture signal), which leads to mistakes in the recording ground truths.

We achieved the proposed method in three steps: Audio Files Processing, Acquisition of Ground Truths, and Recording the Realistic Mixtures.

### 3.1. Audio Files Processing

Our method can be applied to any dataset; we chose TIMIT corpus [32] to build a realistic training dataset. Each chosen audio file from TIMIT will be renamed by combining the dialect region, speaker ID, and sentence text, as is shown in figure 2. This new form of files names points to the path of each file in TIMIT folder, and helps us to maximize the diversity of dialect and gender, and to make mixture names list.




Figure 2. The new form of audio file names of TIMIT

TIMIT has 630 speakers from eight different dialects of American English. We constructed the set  $S$  of different wav files renamed as in figure 2, and also constructed mixture names list  $L$  based on algorithm 1 given in [33]. This algorithm depends on four criteria: rejecting any mixture from two audio files by the same speaker, diversification of uttered speech in the files, maximizing the diversity of speakers within mixtures, and choosing files of similar lengths as much as possible to minimize padding.

### 3.2. Acquisition of the Ground Truths

The most important issue in this paper is the acquisition of ground truth for each speaker, because it is easy to record realistic mixtures but not the corresponding ground truths. It is not useful to consider the clean files of TIMIT as ground truths because the travelled audio signals to the input of the microphone differ from that coming out from the audio output device. The idea is to exploit *APR* function to render and record each speaker file alone with the same conditions used for the recorded mixture. In this case, the recorded signal could be considered as the ground truth for that speaker.

### 3.3. Recording the Realistic Mixture

After the acquisition of ground truth for each speaker, we recorded the realistic mixtures using *APR* function as described above.

In algorithm1 the instruction  $APR(spkl)$  means rendering and recording the wav file  $spkl$  using  $APR$  MATLAB object, and returning the recorded wav file, the lost samples number of overrun, and the lost samples number of underrun. In addition, the instruction  $APR(spkl, spk2)$  means rendering  $spkl$  on the left channel and  $spk2$  on the right channel and recording them simultaneously. It returns the realistic mixture wav file, the overrun lost samples number, and the underrun lost samples number.

---

**Algorithm 1** *Creating Realistic\_TIMIT\_2mix*

**Input:**

- $S$  – set of wav files from TIMIT train folder.
- $L$  – mixtures names list.

**Output:**

- $GTS$  – Folder containing ground truths for speakers.
  - $RealMix$  – Folder containing the realistic mixtures.
- 

```

1:  $i \leftarrow 0$ 
2: while  $i < \text{length}(L)$  do
3:   Extract wav files ( $spk1, spk2$ ) from  $S$  correspond  $L(i)$ .
4:   Down-sampling  $spk1$  &  $spk2$  to 8KHz
5:    $gts1, oRun, uRun = APR(spkl)$ 
   /*  $gts1$  – ground truth for  $spk1$ .
    $oRun$  – overRun lost samples number.
    $uRun$  – underRun lost samples number.
   */
6:   if ( $oRun$  OR  $uRun$ ) > 0 then go to 5
7:   store  $gts1$  in  $GTS$ 
8:    $gts2, oRun, uRun = APR(spkl2)$ 
   //  $gts2$  – ground truth for speaker2.
9:   if ( $oRun$  OR  $uRun$ ) > 0 then go to 8
10:  store  $gts2$  in  $GTS$ 
11:   $rMix, oRun, uRun = APR(spkl \& spkl2)$ 
   //  $rMix$  – realistic Mixture.
12:  if ( $oRun$  OR  $uRun$ ) > 0 then go to 11
13:  store  $rMix$  in  $RealMix$ 
14:   $i \leftarrow i + 1$ 
15:end while

```

---

## 4. Implementation

### 4.1. Constructing the dataset

Algorithm1 implementation should be optimized to run in real time, in order to make the quality of *Realistic\_TIMIT\_2mix* as high as possible. Several factors could affect the quality of the dataset like hardware, operating system, code implementation, and system load. We run algorithm1 on PC with high hardware specifications, with Windows 10, and the MATLAB code was optimized to be at minimum delay. All other unnecessary applications, processes, and services were stopped to minimize the system load.

Algorithms 1 was run on a PC having the following hardware: motherboard ROG STRIX Z390-F GAMING, CPU core i9, RAM 64GB, GPU GeForce RTX 2080 TI, and audio codec type ROG SupremeFX 8-Channel High Definition Audio CODEC S1220A.

Recording *Realistic\_TIMIT\_2mix* was accomplished in a lab far away from noise and bubble. The distance between the microphone and audio output device is about 2 meters. The right and left channels are 50 cm apart, see figure 3. *Realistic\_TIMIT\_2mix* comprises 30 h training set, 10 h validation set, and 5 h testing set.




Figure 3. Experiment Setup of recording realistic dataset

## 4.2. Checking the validation of ground truths

There is a pressing issue that needs to be confirmed: Is the proposed realistic dataset valid for training or not? in other words: can we use the ground truths to train a model to predict a suitable mask for each speaker, so that the separated speech is as clean as possible?

Algorithm 2 is applied to check the validation of the ground truths of the speakers. This algorithm extracts the ideal mask for each speaker using the ground-truths, then reconstruct the estimated speaker using the extracted masks and the mixture. Three types of ideal masks could be used: Ideal Binary Mask (IBM) [34], Ideal Ratio Mask (IRM) [35], and Wiener Filter-like Mask (WFM) [36] defined in equations 3, 4, and 5 respectively.

$$IBM_i(f, t) = \begin{cases} 1, & |S_i(f, t)| > |S_{j \neq i}(f, t)| \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

$$IRM_i(f, t) = \frac{|S_i(f, t)|}{\sum_{j=1}^C |S_j(f, t)|} \quad (4)$$

$$WFM_i(f, t) = \frac{|S_i(f, t)|^2}{\sum_{j=1}^C |S_j(f, t)|^2} \quad (5)$$

Where  $S_i(f, t)$  is the complex-valued spectrograms of the ground truths,  $i = 1, \dots, C$ .

Algorithm 2 was applied for each mask type. Then the SI-SDR and PESQ metrics were calculated for the estimated speakers and the ground-truths.

---

**Algorithm 2** Validation of ground truths.

**Input:**

- $gts_i$  – ground truth for  $spk_i$ .
- $mix$  – mixture signal.

**Output:**

- $PESQ$  - Perceptual Evaluation Speech Quality.
  - $SI\_SDR$  - Scale Invariant Signal to Distortion Ratio
- 

```

1:  $S_i \leftarrow STFT(gts_i)$  // STFT-Short Time Fourier Transform
2:  $M \leftarrow STFT(mix)$ 
3:  $mask_i \leftarrow zeros(size(S_i))$ 
4: for each element  $(f, t)$  in matrix  $S_i$  do
5:    $mask_i(f, t) \leftarrow \{IBM_i(f, t) \text{ or } IRM_i(f, t) \text{ or } WFM_i(f, t)\}$ 
6: end for
7:  $est_{si} \leftarrow iSTFT((|M| \odot mask_i), \angle M)$ 
8:  $SI\_SDR \leftarrow si\_sdr([gts_i], [est_{si}])$ 
9:  $PESQ \leftarrow pesq([gts_i], [est_{si}])$ 
10: return  $SI\_SDR, PESQ$ 

```

---

Algorithm 2 was repeated for every mixture in *Realistic\_TIMIT\_2mix*. Thereafter, in Table 1, we give the averaged PESQ values and SI-SDR values.

Table 1. SI-SDR and PESQ average values for the ground truths evaluation.

Metrics	<i>Realistic_TIMIT_2mix</i>		
	IBM	IRM	WFM
SI-SDR (dB)	14.1	13.9	<b>14.3</b>
PESQ	3.12	3.16	<b>3.20</b>

Table 1 shows that *Realistic\_TIMIT\_2mix* has high quality ground truths especially with WFM masks as compared with real conditions, where they got only SI-SDR values of 2.8 dB [16]. Hence, *Realistic\_TIMIT\_2mix* is suitable for training neural models.

### 4.3. Model Configuration

In order to benchmark *Realistic\_TIMIT\_2mix*, and prove whether it is better than synthetic dataset or not, it is important to design synthetic mixtures from the same files used in building *Realistic\_TIMIT\_2mix*, we called it *synthetic\_TIMIT\_2mix*.

For speech separation, we used the deep learning model given in [37]. The model consists of four stacked layers of Bidirectional Gated Recurrent Unit networks (BGRUs), followed by a fully connected feed forward layer. The input features are the logarithmic spectral magnitudes of the mixtures. The spectrum is obtained by Short Time Fourier Transform (STFT) with 32ms window length, 8ms hop size, and hanning window. Figure 4 describes the model which maps each Time-Frequency bin into an embedding vector in a latent space. A Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM) is then applied as a clustering algorithm to estimate each mask.

The parameters of the base model are as follows. The optimizer algorithm is ADAM [38] with a training rate starting of  $10^{-3}$ , which will be halved if the validation error does not reduce in the last three epochs. The number of epochs is 300, and the batch size 128.

Two copies of the base model with the same parameters are used for training. One on *Realistic\_TIMIT\_2mix*, and the other on *synthetic\_TIMIT\_2mix*. The comparison between both results is given in section 5. For simplicity we call the base model trained on *Realistic\_TIMIT\_2mix* the **Realistic model**, and the model trained on *synthetic\_TIMIT\_2mix* the **Synthetic model**.




Figure 4. The Base Model used for learning




Figure 5. Loss Function for Synthetic and Realistic models

The validation loss for every model was drawn in figure 5. Realistic model loss reached its minimum (0.23) at epoch 157, and the Synthetic model loss reached its minimum (0.26) at epoch 143. The Synthetic model is faster in convergence, but the minimum value of loss function for Realistic model is less than the minimum value of Synthetic model. Overfitting in Synthetic is growing faster than overfitting in Realistic model. Early stop is used to handle overfitting.

#### 4.4. Evaluation metrics

We considered the Scale Invariant Signal to Distortion Ratio (SI-SDR) [39] as an evaluation metric to measure the speech separation accuracy. We also evaluated the quality of the reconstructed signals by Perceptual Evaluation Speech Quality (PESQ). Evaluation is achieved using three datasets as mentioned in the following section.

### 5. Results and Analysis

To benchmark our realistic model, we test it in three conditions: clean synthetic mixtures, noisy synthetic mixtures, and realistic mixtures, using the three testing datasets: Clean Libri2Mix, noisy Libri2Mix, and *Realistic Test*:

Libri2Mix: is a synthetic dataset which has two versions clean and noisy. Noisy Libri2Mix is based on LibriSpeech with ambient noise samples from WHAM! [17]

Realistic Test: the ultimate goal of speech separation is to separate mixtures in realistic conditions. That is why it is more meaningful to test on realistic mixtures than synthetic ones.

We recorded 5 h of *Realistic\_TIMIT\_2mix* for testing, using Test folder from TIMIT corpus (having other speakers than those used in the training). We called these 5 h mixtures: *Realistic Test*.

In fact, the distance between the audio output device and the microphone was 2 meters when we recorded the training dataset *Realistic\_TIMIT\_2mix*. We suggest to check the performance on different distances. Six copies of *Realistic Test* were designed with different distances between the audio output device and the microphone {0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3} meters, the idea of changing the distance is to evaluate the robustness of the performance with the variation of the distance.

On the other hand, it is well known that separation accuracy is very high in clean synthetic datasets (e.g. on WSJ0-2Mix) using the best neural model for separation, but it decreases sharply in synthetic mixtures with noise and reverberation (e.g. WHAMR!), and it is worse than that in real-life mixtures [16]. The separation results achieved by Realistic and Synthetic models on the three testing datasets are reported in tables 2, 3, and 4. We notice that Realistic model outperformed the Synthetic model on all the three testing datasets. Table 4 shows an improvement in SI-SDR (exceeding 1.5 dB), while tables 2 and 3 depict an improvement greater or equal to 1.25 dB. We conclude the



outperformance of the Realistic model over synthetic model on either realistic or synthetic mixtures. Tables 2 and 3 show the impact of noise on the performance of both models (Realistic and Synthetic). They also show the outperformance of the Realistic model by about 1.27 dB.

Table 2. SI-SDR and PESQ on Noisy Libri2Mix using Realistic and Synthetic models.

Model	SI-SDR(dB)	PESQ
Realistic Model	<b>11.08</b>	<b>2.01</b>
Synthetic Model	9.81	1.54

Table 3. SI-SDR and PESQ on Clean Libri2Mix, using Realistic and Synthetic models.

Model	SI-SDR(dB)	PESQ
Realistic Model	<b>13.65</b>	<b>2.68</b>
Synthetic Model	12.40	2.19

Table 4. SI-SDR and PESQ on Realistic Test (2m distance between microphone and output device) using Realistic and Synthetic models.

Model	SI-SDR(dB)	PESQ
Realistic Model	<b>8.66</b>	<b>2.09</b>
Synthetic Model	7.01	1.68

In order to study the impact of changing the distance between microphone and audio output device, we measured the performance of both models (realistic and synthetic) on different distances. Figure 6 shows that the performance of realistic model is more stable and robust against distance changes; the SI-SDR using the synthetic model decreased to a value less than 2.5 dB when the distance increased to 3 meters, while the realistic model did not change a lot and it remained above 8 dB.

Figure 7 also reflects the stability of PESQ values, using the realistic model with the variation of distance, when compared with the use of the synthetic model. It shows the degradation of perceptual metric with the distance increase when using the synthetic model. Previous results show the superiority of the realistic model and confirm the explicit effectiveness of our method of recording in realistic acoustic conditions.




Figure 6. The effect of distance changes (between audio output device and mic) on SI-SDR for realistic and synthetic models.




Figure 7. The effect of distance changes (between audio output device and mic) on PESQ for realistic and synthetic models.

## 6. Conclusion

In this work, we proved that it is possible to design realistic mixtures of two speakers with high quality ground truths to be used in supervised learning for speech separation. We introduced a new method to record a realistic dataset with ground truths for single-channel speaker separation. The results revealed that training on our realistic dataset (realistic model) improves the separation accuracy and the perceptual evaluation compared to the training on synthetic datasets (synthetic model) by up to 1.65 dB for SI-SDR and approximately 0.5 for PESQ. We also evaluated the effect of changing the distance between audio output device and microphone on the performance on both realistic and synthetic models; our realistic model outperformed the synthetic model in all cases. It showed more accuracy and stability in performance than the synthetic model. In future work, we plan to address the variability and complexity of real-world audio by considering noise issues and model architecture.

## Acknowledgments

The authors thank the Department of Telecommunications at the Higher Institute for Applied Sciences and Technology for full support.

## 7. References

- [1] E. C. Cherry, "Some Experiments on the Recognition of Speech, with One and with Two Ears,," *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, vol. 25, no. 5, p. 975–979, Sep. 1953.
- [2] J. R. Hershey, Z. Chen, J. L. Roux and S. Watanabe, "DEEP CLUSTERING: DISCRIMINATIVE EMBEDDINGS FOR SEGMENTATION AND SEPARATION," *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2016.
- [3] Z. Chen, Y. Luo and N. Mesgarani, "Deep attractor network for single-microphone speaker separation," in *In 2017 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP) (pp. 246-250)*. IEEE, 2017.
- [4] C. Subakan, M. Ravanelli, S. Cornell, M. Bronzi and J. Zhong, "ATTENTION IS ALL YOU NEED IN SPEECH SEPARATION," *arXiv:2010.13154v1*, 25 Oct 2020.
- [5] G.-P. Yang, C.-I. Tuan, H.-Y. Lee and L.-s. Lee, "Improved Speech Separation with Time-and-Frequency Cross-domain Joint Embedding and Clustering," *arXiv:1904.07845*, 16 Apr 2019.
- [6] D. Yu, M. Kolbæk, T. Zheng-Hua and J. Jensen, "Permutation invariant training of deep models for speaker-independent multi-talker speech separation," *International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2017 IEEE .
- [7] 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, October 2017).
- [8] Z.-Q. Wang, S. Cornell, S. Choi, Y. Lee, B.-Y. Kim and S. Watanabe, "TF-GRIDNET: MAKING TIME-FREQUENCY DOMAIN MODELS GREAT AGAIN FOR MONAURAL SPEAKER SEPARATION," *arXiv:2209.03952*, 15 Mar 2023.
- [9] Y. Luo and N. Mesgarani, "TASNET: TIME-DOMAIN AUDIO SEPARATION NETWORK FOR REAL-TIME, SINGLE-CHANNEL SPEECH SEPARATION," *IEEE, ICASSP 2018*, 2018.
- [10] 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, AUGUST 2019.
- [11] Y. Luo, Z. Chen and T. Yoshioka, "DUAL-PATH RNN: EFFICIENT LONG SEQUENCE MODELING FOR TIME-DOMAIN SINGLE-CHANNEL SPEECH SEPARATION," *IEEE, ICASSP 2020*.
- [12] J. Chen, Q. Mao and D. Liu, "Dual-Path Transformer Network: Direct Context-Aware Modeling for End-to-End Monaural Speech Separation," *arXiv:2007.13975*, 14 Aug 2020.
- [13] N. Zeghidour and D. Grangier, "Wavesplit: End-to-End Speech Separation by Speaker Clustering," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing* 29, pp. 2840-2849, 2021.
- [14] J. Luo, J. Wang, N. Cheng, E. Xiao, X. Zhang and J. Xiao, "Tiny-Sepformer: A Tiny Time-Domain Transformer Network for Speech Separation," *arXiv:2206.13689*, 30 Jun 2022.
- [15] 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*, 2019.
- [16] C. Subakan, M. Ravanelli, S. Cornell and F. Grondin, "REAL-M: TOWARDS SPEECH SEPARATION ON REAL MIXTURES," *arXiv:2110.10812*, 20 Oct 2021.
- [17] G. Wichern, J. Antognini, M. Flynn, L. Richard Zhu, E. McQuinn, D. Crow, E. Manilow and J. Le Roux, "WHAM!: Extending Speech Separation to Noisy Environments," *arXiv:1907.01160*, 2 Jul 2019.
- [18] M. Maciejewski, G. Wichern, E. McQuinn and J. Le Roux, "WHAMR!: NOISY AND REVERBERANT SINGLE-CHANNEL SPEECH SEPARATION," *ICASSP 2020-2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, IEEE, 2020.
- [19] J. Cosentino, M. Pariente, S. Cornell, A. Deleforge and E. Vincent, "LibriMix: An Open-Source Dataset for Generalizable Speech Separation," *arXiv:2005.11262*, 22 May 2020.

- [20] J. Barker, R. Marxer, E. Vincent and S. Watanabe, "THE THIRD 'CHIME' SPEECH SEPARATION AND RECOGNITION CHALLENGE: DATASET, TASK AND BASELINES," *IEEE Workshop on Automatic Speech Recognition and Understanding (ASRU)*, 2015.
- [21] J. Barker, S. Watanabe, E. Vincent and J. Trmal, "The fifth 'CHiME' Speech Separation and Recognition Challenge: Dataset, task and baselines," *arXiv:1811.02641*, 6 Nov 2018.
- [22] L. Brandschain, D. Graff, C. Cieri, K. Walker, C. Caruso and A. Neely, "The Mixer 6 Corpus: Resources for Cross-Channel and Text Independent Speaker Recognition," *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'10)*, 2010..
- [23] A. Nagrani, J. Son Chung and A. Zisserman, "VoxCeleb: a large-scale speaker identification dataset," *arXiv:1706.08612*, 30 May 2018.
- [24] M. Maciejewski, J. Shi, S. Watanabe and S. Khudanpur, "TRAINING NOISY SINGLE-CHANNEL SPEECH SEPARATION WITH NOISY ORACLE SOURCES: A LARGE GAP AND A SMALL STEP," *arXiv:2010.12430*, 22 Feb 2021.
- [25] V. Panayotov, G. Chen, D. Povey and S. Khudanpur, "LIBRISPEECH: AN ASR CORPUS BASED ON PUBLIC DOMAIN AUDIO BOOKS," *ICASSP*, p. 5206–5210, 2015.
- [26] 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, July 2017.
- [27] K. Saijo and T. Ogawa, "REMIX-CYCLE-CONSISTENT LEARNING ON ADVERSARIALLY LEARNED SEPARATOR FOR ACCURATE AND STABLE UNSUPERVISED SPEECH SEPARATION," *arXiv:2203.14080*, 26 Mar 2022.
- [28] S. Wisdom, E. Tzinis, H. Erdogan, R. J. Weiss, K. Wilson and J. R. Hershey, "Unsupervised Sound Separation Using Mixture Invariant Training," *arXiv:2006.12701v2*, 24 Oct 2020.
- [29] J. Zhang, C. Zorila, R. Doddipatla and J. Barker, "Teacher-Student MixIT for Unsupervised and Semi-supervised Speech Separation," *arXiv:2106.07843*, 9 Sep 2021.
- [30] J. Han and Y. Long, "Heterogeneous separation consistency training for adaptation of unsupervised speech separation," *EURASIP Journal on Audio, Speech, and Music Processing*, no. 1, pp. 1-17, 2023.
- [31] N. Q. Duong, "Modeling of Convolutional Audio Mixtures Applied to Source Separation," *Signal and Image Processing. Université Rennes*, 2011.
- [32] J. S. Garofolo, L. F. Lamel, W. M. Fisher, J. G. Fiscus, D. S. Pallett and N. L. Dahlgren, "DARPA TIMIT acoustic-phonetic continuous speech corpus CD-ROM. NIST speech disc 1-1.1," *NASA STI/Recon technical report n, 93, 27403*, 1993.
- [33] M. Maciejewski, G. Sell, L. P. Garcia-Perera, S. Watanabe and S. Khudanpur, "BUILDING CORPORA FOR SINGLE-CHANNEL SPEECH SEPARATION ACROSS MULTIPLE DOMAINS," *arXiv:1811.02641*, 6 Nov 2018.
- [34] Y. Li and D. Wang, "On the Optimality of Ideal Binary Time-Frequency Masks," *Speech Communication*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 230-239, 2009.
- [35] A. Narayanan and D. Wang, "IDEAL RATIO MASK ESTIMATION USING DEEP NEURAL NETWORKS FOR ROBUST SPEECH RECOGNITION," *In 2013 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, pp. 7092-7096, 2013.
- [36] H. Erdogan, J. R. Hershey, S. Watanabe and J. L. Roux, "Phase-sensitive and Recognition-boosted Speech Separation Using Deep Recurrent Neural Networks," *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pp. 708-712, April 2015.
- [37] R. Melhem, A. Jafar and R. Hamadeh, "Improving deep attractor network by BGRU and GMM for speech separation," *Journal of Harbin Institute of Technology (New Series)*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 90-96, 2021.
- [38] D. P. Kingma and J. Ba, "Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization," *arXiv:1412.6980v9*, 30 Jan 2017.
- [39] J. Le Roux, S. Wisdom, H. Erdogan and J. R. Hershey, "SDR – HALF-BAKED OR WELL DONE?," *ICASSP, IEEE* 2019.