Phoneme/Text

Bijoy Singh (120050087) Sai Kiran Mudulkar(120050068) Manik Dhar(120050006)

Idea:

Train to HMMs using the CMU dataset.

One for word to phoneme conversion and the other for phoneme to word.

As the CMU dataset is tagged, this becomes a supervised learning problem.

We use the MLE to find HMM parameters and Viterbi to do the actual conversion.

Idea: (Contd.)

The transitions are of the form

$$SI \Rightarrow \mid O \mid \Rightarrow SII$$

Where O is the observation and S I and S II are the hidden states.

We have pruned the data set so that only words where the number of graphenes are equal to the number of phonemes are considered.

Idea: (Contd.)

For grapheme to phoneme conversion the states are the phoneme and graphemes are the observations.

The opposite is done when converting phonemes to graphemes.

Idea: (Contd.)

$$P(S I \Rightarrow | O | \Rightarrow S II) = n(S I \Rightarrow | O | \Rightarrow S II)/n$$

(S I)

n(S I) = no of times S I appears in the data set. $n(S I \Rightarrow | O | \Rightarrow S II) = number of times S I is$ followed by SII in the dataset with O in the observation sequence corresponding to S II.

Implementation

We store a transition table to store the probabilities which we store in a file to avoid repeated training.

The phoneme sequence is made using the ARPABET notation. To produce sound we convert the output in ARPABET to ESpeak notation (IPA).

There is a GUI interface to do the conversion

Interface



UI interface and API to allow for easier usage

Interface Properties

Allows for word to phoneme and phoneme to word conversion.

Word can be converted to IPA, ARPAbet or eSpeak notation.

The user can also simply enter a sentence which he or she wants to speak and it will speak it.

Performance:

We performed 5 fold cross validation after permuting the input set. The results are as follows:

Average Word Conversion Accuracy:

0.7338947118582697

Average Phoneme Conversion Accuracy:

0.8014263311120567

Confusion Matrix (GrGr)

	[@	IA I.	S		B	ĮΕ	ĮR	G	C	ļΗ	N	ļΚ	ĮL	1	ĮΥ	ĮΤ	IM	10	D	ĮV	ĮU	W	Z	ĮF.	ΙX	IJ	ĮQ	-	ĮΡ	_	l									
@		П					Π	Τ					Π	Π				Π			Ι			Π	Τ	Τ	Τ	Π	 											
Α	4	i i	81		20	168	9	83	16	105		10	57	34	329		492		9	77	44	244	8	16	14	271		26	2	14	7				25					
1		19	17	1	ĺ	61	2	ĺ	ĺ	ĺ	25	ĺ	12	18	2	7	11	12	4	1	ĺ	ĺ	1	4	3	İ	1	ĺ	2											
S	4	76 3			ĺ	70	2	1	643		1	26	2	15	40	2	34	1	62	ĺ	1	39		425		İ	4	3	ĺ		4	1								
		1	3		ĺ	7	2	ĺ	2		2	ĺ	3	12	1	1	3	İ	ĺ	ĺ	1	ĺ	1	1	1	İ	İ	İ	ĺ		ĺ									
В	3	25	15		ĺ	1	3	ĺ	ĺ	ĺ		ĺ	3	14	ĺ	1	18	9	ĺ	ĺ	19	ĺ	ĺ	ĺ	İ	İ	İ	İ	ĺ		ĺ									
E	4	2505	138		139		ĺ	29	ĺ	91	27	80	4	163		16	664		307	9	313		266		58	688		54	64	156		6	22	13	34	17			51	
R	3	42	3		15	209			3	19	1	9	8	5	67	2	70	7	72	6	4	10	2		4	1	1			22										
G	2	8	2			18	1		4	3	246		4		8				28	1		6				5	125													
C	3	91 3	1069	9			193		245		2		1	24	151	2	3	100		13	101		1	9			23		21		104			14		17				
Н		29	7			12	6	2	32		4	4	7	18	8	19	1	15			18	13		7	1	3		6												
N	2	192		1			91	6	3				3		334		16	8	1	45	5		61									5								
K	3	18	16			3	93		202	2	1	5		2	3	1			4			6		L.		31		13												
L	2	557		30		6	143		4	4	48	1		5		82	3	8		135				123				1					42							
I	4	769	1					196		71				119		27	•		•	841		291			303		39	•	87	5	85	15	7	21			46	9		
Υ	1	31	5			239		4		16	1	6			247			12	1	27	•		57	2	•	3		164				1								
Т	1	288		135				56	18		167		3	41	1	6	68				•	8		9		32	2	1			1	1								
М	3	90	44		3	17							8	14				17			45			1																
0	8	4139		30		•	288		51	•	18					156		3			•	24	6	109		26		6	21	1			24							
D		37			1	34		27	1		27		9		6	31		11			17					8														
V	2	16				7	3				1		6	59		3		12				11		17																
U	1	1672		64		2	375		23	:	21	11				312		163			13	392		5			209		2	2	6	21	1		4					
W		10	33			1	4			•	1		9	6	•	4		11	•	66	48			19			4													
Z	2	4	1100	9		1	3				2			•	30	2	86		1		•	1																		
F		33	1				5			•	2		•	15				4		5	4	76			!	!	!		3											
Х	3		90			4		57	•				132			1		11					2		22	!	!				7	!								
J	1	3	9			1		266		6	23				16	60	1	1	5	2		30	3		!	!	!					!								
Q			2			1	1		97			137			1				1																					
-		3	1				1			2	2	1	1	•	•	2					2				2					2										
Р	1	22	119				5	6						12	2	1	3	7	7			1	1		16															
			1								7			1															1											

Confusion Matrix (GrGr) conclusions

We can see that some alphabets are characteristic of being confused to others

 $A \leftrightarrow E, A \leftrightarrow O, S \leftrightarrow C, E \leftrightarrow I \text{ etc.}$

These confusion are legitimate as even english has these issues.

Confusion Matrix(PhPh)

	[@	AA	AE	AH	40 j	AW	AY	B	јсн	D	DH	ЕН	ER	EY	F	G	јнн	ļΙΗ	İIY	јJН	ļΚ	ļL	M	N	NG	OW	OY.	P	R	S	SH	ļΤ	TH	UH	UW	١V	W	ĮΥ	Z	ZH	I				
@ AA AE AH 19		 1343 1818 259	3 į		2352 2698 	1	 32 13 25	İ	 1 16	 13 2 18		 6 3 31		 452 157 219	l		 144 93 261	4	 4 19		 4 3 15	 10 8 132	İ		9	16	42	 15 1 123		 182 49	6		7	 15 1989	11	 4 	 10 16		 4 47	 15 3 	 1 3 86	3	İ	2 447	1
AO AW AY B CH D	j 	896 8	1	126 81 11 96 16 6 47	1		 3	1	 	2 11 1	 	 9 22 6	 - 5 	5 7 1 	1 2		1 3 	 672 8 33	6 5		 186	4	3 1	6 11 8	1 	 15 22 3 10	5 	j I	 1 15 1 6		10 79	i	 1 1 79 	36 	4 5 7 21	 6 1	3 4 	2 1	 4 1 1	 12 1	 25 	1 	1	I	
EH ER EY F G HH	i	434 22 342 7 6	2	3 : 10 : 428 15 : 14 : 2	7 13	672	1 3 1	 	 	2 2 	4 	4 69 5 2	 2 	 1 1	1 368	7	İ	 5 8 10 5	4 1 10 	i	1 3 9	301 63 8 66	 89 1	İ	 17	65 26 3 19	j 5	 17 15 	4	1 3 2	į į	i	32 1 	 11	9	20 12 315 20 8	i 	14 2 4 4 9	33 5	i	 1 	i	19 16		
IH IY JH K L M	2 7 1 1 1	3 80 58 17	2 34 13 3	1231 942 3	j 5 	3	 2 8	210 182 18 1 8		1 35 25 	 10	57			 19	27 489 18 37	34 11 1	 36	17 7 6	4 117	6		 1 32 	3 2 39 4 4	7 2 3 	96 56 3 1 1 5	4 4 8	54 22 8 	220 24 13	1 1 385 1	10 12 12	 22	18 41 27 	i i	19		68 5 126	1 9 26 5	 5 35 4 6 		56 2 7 		21 11	16	i
NG OW OY P R S	İ	 618 14 21	1 16 30 4	 2 2 16 73	з ј	1	 46 1	 		1 1 		 8 39 29 79	 3 179	 2	2 3 4	221	1 1 10	 1 1 14 2 71	4 1 6 5 45 73	 47 	3 2 3 819	6 5 40 4	 5 8 15	10 1 1 4	112 1 4 10	11 2 4 	 16 13	 	 15 3	 8 4 12	 19 2	2 7 2 6 	 38 115	21	13 5	 27	11 2 1	3 6 1	- 7 	2 2 1 9	7 7 32		1	33	
SH T TH UH UW V	 1 	3 9 7 12	5 6 2	2	 1		 1 1 1	 1	 1 1 30	İ	İ	 48 8	 2 32 1	 1 2	12 16	18	 5 22 6 82	 18 4 8 5	190 162 1 19 12 3	 4 	93 3 8 9	 32 4 10	9 128 1	20 2 1 1	 64 	10 14 77 4 13	 	30	 76 4	2 1 3	 22 	8 15 69 1 2	j I	 114 1	1 1 109 39	i ¦	52 	 1 73	 1	 1	 17 76 	i	1	I	
Y Z ZH		1		693 25 1			1	11 	26 		2 		22 2 	 				18 156 		342 17 7		163 3 3	2 	27 	10 5 	7 	20 1 	 	9 		1 295: 5		2	14	26 2	 	98 23 		 8	 2 	42 		4	1 1	

Confusion Matrix (PhPh)

conclusions

We can see that some phonemes are characteristic of being confused to others

 $AA \leftrightarrow AE, AA \leftrightarrow AH, OW \leftrightarrow AA, AH \leftrightarrow AE$ etc.

These confusion are legitimate as the sounds are close and their occurrences are in generally similar surrounding context.

Optimisation Attempts

- 1) Non Zero probability initially
- 2) Trigram Model
- 3) Neural Networks(Later)

Non Zero initial probability

The logic behind this is that many possibilities of the state diagram is nullified by the o probabilities existing due to no data seen for these transitions.

Instead of o we add 10-10 to allow for some weightage. We see not too much improvement of 0.01%(not much huh!)

Average Word Conversion Accuracy: 0.7430759192440042 Average Phoneme Conversion Accuracy: 0.8014293446848637

Trigram:

We changed the state machine to work with trigrams. The results were as follows:

Average Word Conversion Accuracy:

0.6153025931351043

Average Phoneme Conversion Accuracy: 0.7398425392381858

Trigram Output Analysing

The performance of the machine reduces with the trigram assumption(besides it takes significantly more time to solve), this is expected for the reason that the new state transistion ((S1,S2),S3,O) requires more training to get trainined and that the english model for equi-phone-grapheme words may not be too much effected by this assumption.



Thank You