Latex Template for WAC 2016

Nicholas Jillings
n.g.r.jillings@se14.qmul.ac.uk

Brecht De Man
b.deman@qmul.ac.uk

David Moffat
d.j.moffat@qmul.ac.uk

Joshua D. Reiss
joshua.reiss@qmul.ac.uk

Centre for Digital Music
School of Electronic Engineering and Computer Science
Queen Mary University of London
Mile End Road, London E1 4NS
United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

Here comes the abstract.

1. INTRODUCTION

Introducing the paper. Referring to [2]. Talking about what we do in the various sections of this paper. Pointing out that the header of the paper kind of looks like the Bat-sign.

2. ARCHITECTURE

A slightly technical overview of the system. Talk about XML, JavaScript, Web Audio API, HTML5.

3. INTERFACES

We could add more interfaces, such as:

- Hedonic Scale

- Multi attribute ratings

- MUSHRA (ITU-R BS. 1534)

- Interval Scale

- Rank Scale

- 2D Plane rating - e.g. Valence vs. Arousal

- Likert scale

- **All the following are the interfaces available in HULTI-GEN [1]**

- ABC/HR (ITU-R BS. 1116)

  - Continuous Scale (5-1) Imperceptible, Perceptible but not annoying, slightly annoying, annoying, very annoying. (default Inaudible?)

- -50 to 50 Bipolar with Ref

  - Scale -50 to 50 on Mushra with default values as 0 in middle and a comparison "Reference" to compare to 0 value

- Absolute Category Rating (ACR) Scale

  - 5 point Scale - Bad, Poor, Fair, Good, Excellent (Default fair?)

- Degradation Category Rating (DCR) Scale

  - 5 point Scale - Inaudible, Audible but not annoying, slightly annoying, annoying, very annoying. (default Inaudible?) - *Basically just quantised ABC/HR?*

- Comparison Category Rating (CCR) Scale

  - 7 point scale: Much Better, Better, Slightly Better, About the same, slightly worse, worse, much worse - Default about the same with reference to compare to

- 9 Point Hedonic Category Rating Scale

  - 9 point scale: Like Extremely, Like Very Much, Like Moderate, Like Slightly, Neither Like nor Dislike, dislike Extremely, dislike Very Much, dislike Moderate, dislike Slightly - Default Neither Like nor Dislike with reference to compare to

- ITU-R 5 Point Continuous Impairment Scale

  - 5 point Scale (5-1) Imperceptible, Perceptible but not annoying, slightly annoying, annoying, very annoying. (default Inaudible?)- *Basically just quantised ABC/HR, or Different named DCR*

- Pairwise Comparison (Better/Worse)

  - 2 point Scale - Better or Worse - (not sure how to default this - they default everything to better, which is an interesting choice)

There are also the following interfaces, which would require a slightly different 'engine' underneath, e.g. loading a different page for every possible pair.

- AB Test

- ABX Test

- JND

A screenshot would be nice.

4. ANALYSIS AND DIAGNOSTICS

It would be great to have easy-to-use analysis tools to visualise the collected data and even do science with it. Even better would be to have all this in the browser. Complete perfection would be achieved if and when only limited setup, installation time, and expertise are required for the average non-CS researcher to use this.

Some pictures here please.

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Perhaps an 'engineering brief' such as this one doesn't really have a lot of conclusion, except 'We made this'.

You can check it out at code.soundsoftware.ac.uk/projects/webaudioevaluationtool.

6. FUTURE WORK

Perhaps here, perhaps not. Talking a little bit about what else might happen. Unless we really want to wrap this up.

7. REFERENCES

[1] C. Gribben and H. Lee. Toward the development of a universal listening test interface generator in max. In *Audio Engineering Society Convention 138*. Audio Engineering Society, 2015.

[2] N. Jillings, D. Moffat, B. De Man, and J. D. Reiss. Web Audio Evaluation Tool: A browser-based listening test environment. In *12th Sound and Music Computing Conference*, July 2015.