Notes\_on\_datasets

I use a text editor (Sublime) to help me count occurrences within datasets.

# aesdd

From the readme

For the creation of v.1 of the database, 5 (3 female and 2 male) professional actors were recorded. 19 utterances of ambiguous out of context emotional content were chosen. The actors acted these 19 utterances in every one of the 5 chosen emotions. One extra improvised utterance was added for every actor and emotion. The guidance of the actors and the choice of the final recordings were supervised by a scientific expert in dramatology. For some of the utterances, more that one takes were qualified. Consequently, around 500 utterances occured in the final database.

No gender labels, but I manually determined that speakers 1, 2, and 5 are female-sounding and speakers 3, 4, and 6 are male-sounding. Contrary to the documentation, the dataset actually contains 6 different speakers.

# anad

There’s something up with the segmented files; they all sound the same?

Labels at the discourse level? Low face validity

# BAUM1

There are misspellings in the emotion labels.

“Subject Label”, “Clip”, and “Clip Name” don’t always match in the acted annotations: S019\_006, S019\_008, S019\_009, S019\_010, S019\_011, S019\_012, S019\_013, S019\_014, S019\_015, S019\_016, S019\_017, S019\_018, S019\_019, S019\_020, S019\_021, S019\_022, S019\_023

I have manually corrected these in preclean.tsv

Not all files appear in the annotations excel files. I looked and found 72 such files.

To recode these, I looked for other samples with similar elicitation prompts. This worked fine for the acted samples (8), but the spontaneous samples (64) are more heterogenous. I matched the subtitles of 3 of these exactly with others and carried over the labels. The rest were too subjective for me to feel confident rating them on my own. 61 records dropped

They made the actors watch some disturbing stuff to elicit emotions…

From the paper

The data was collected from 31 subjects, 17 of which are female, which are shown in Fig. 2. All subjects are native speakers of Turkish, and have an age range of 19-65.

…



The paper is inconsistent on the actual number of participants coded female.

S015\_007 spontaneous emo label does not match emo code in annotations!

Some mp4s no audio? Check downstream

Boredom is mapped to negative valence (van Tilburg & Igou, 2017; Kort, Reilly, & Picard, 2001); Regan, Mandryk, & Atkins (2007)

Interest is mapped to positive valence (Kort, Reilly, & Picard, 2001); remapped to curiosity; see notes in emoreact section on curiosity

Contempt mapped to negative (Trnka, Mana, & Kuška, 2021; Ferran 2017; Melwani, Mueller, & Overbeck, 2012)

Surprise is negative (Noordewier & Breugelmans 2013; Koch, Alves, & Krüger 2016; Noordewier, Topolinski, & Van Dijk 2016)

Unsure->uncertain

Bothered can be negative too

# BAUM2

Extensive manual Pre-cleaning done in data\_dir.xlsx; stages of processing go from leftmost sheet to rightmost sheet

Recoded to valence and recounted majority vote

Turkish and English

# cafe

Surprise is now negative

“This dataset includes six different sentences, pronounced by twelve actors, in six basic emotions plus one neutral emotion. The basic emotions are acted in two different intensities. This represents a total of 936 different audio samples.”

All samples accounted for

Québec French

# CREMA-D

“There are 91 actors, 48 male and 43 female (51 actors worked with one director, 40 with the another). The actors were between the ages of 20 and 74 with a mean age of 36. Table 2 provides detailed age information. Several racial and ethnic backgrounds were represented in the actor group: Caucasian, African American, Hispanic, and Asian. Table 3 provides a detailed breakdown of the racial and ethnic groups.”

FROM README:   
CREMA-D is a data set of 7,442 original clips from 91 actors. These clips were from 48 male and 43 female actors between the ages of 20 and 74 coming from a variety of races and ethnicities (African America, Asian, Caucasian, Hispanic, and Unspecified).

Actors spoke from a selection of 12 sentences. The sentences were presented using one of six different emotions (Anger, Disgust, Fear, Happy, Neutral, and Sad) and four different emotion levels (Low, Medium, High, and Unspecified).

Participants rated the emotion and emotion levels based on the combined audiovisual presentation, the video alone, and the audio alone.

Crowd-sourced ratings

“Binomial majority is used to define majority recognition. Unlike traditional majority, which is defined as more than 50% of raters having selected the specific emotion, binomial majority is achieved when a binomial test would reject at the 95% confidence level the null hypothesis that the most commonly chosen label is selected randomly from the six possible labels.”

* Recode intended emotions to valence
* Recode votes to valence
  + A, D, F, S -> -1, N -> 0, H -> 1
  + H:N -> 1
  + Remaining -> -1 if the vote string doesn’t contain “N”
* Retain the record if any of VoiceVote valence, FaceVoteValence, or MultiModalVote valence matches the intended valence

Discarded 569, kept 6873

Intended emotion used for final valence label

# filelist is copy-pasted from data\_selection.xlsx

# dzafic

Just 6 samples, so I created the tsv manually

# ekorpus

The corpus contains 1,234 Estonian sentences that express anger, joy and sadness, or are neutral. [867 retained]

Female voice, 44.1 KHz, 16Bit, Mono;

wav, textgrid: phonemes, words, sentences.

The audio-recordings and text of sentences can be downloaded and saved.

^ <https://metashare.ut.ee/repository/browse/estonian-emotional-speech-corpus/4d42d7a8463411e2a6e4005056b40024a19021a316b54b7fb707757d43d1a889/>

Elicited spontaneously

Used <http://peeter.eki.ee:5000/reports/valence>

To filter only samples with >51% rater recognition for positive, negative, and neutral valence

[Text influence: all

Emotion: all

Min. recognition %: 51]

Filter op returned list of sample IDs

Used the corresponding textgrid field for emotion category label

69 Sample IDs missing from dataset: 466, 468, 475, 481, 485, 493, 495, 499, 509, 511, 521, 550, 552, 554, 556, 558, 564, 570, 572, 578, 582, 586, 588, 592, 594, 598, 608, 612, 626, 638, 642, 469, 471, 473, 507, 515, 519, 525, 527, 529, 531, 533, 535, 537, 541, 545, 547, 548, 560, 562, 566, 568, 574, 584, 590, 596, 600, 602, 604, 606, 610, 614, 620, 622, 624, 632, 634, 640, 644, 646

253 sample IDs discarded since perceived valence did not match intended valence:  
120325, 13875, 13701, 13935, 13737, 120706, 120732, 13673, 14039, 121322, 121324, 173, 217, 229, 279, 285, 13435, 13473, 13525, 13661, 13677, 13683, 13687, 13743, 13799, 13877, 13879, 13903, 13917, 13923, 13929, 13967, 13979, 120151, 120161, 120171, 120173, 120203, 120221, 120225, 120227, 120233, 120317, 120365, 120526, 120532, 120534, 120536, 120572, 120590, 120692, 120712, 120718, 120744, 120901, 120909, 120961, 121141, 121188, 121208, 121286, 121312, 171, 121330, 13639, 14131, 14163, 14167, 14179, 14353, 120263, 120311, 120403, 120568, 120596, 120598, 120600, 120616, 120676, 120738, 120819, 120857, 120943, 120951, 120955, 120963, 120971, 121003, 121123, 121145, 121156, 121194, 121206, 57, 91, 175, 269, 395, 13249, 13311, 13335, 13341, 13627, 43, 120279, 120281, 120845, 65, 69, 120323, 121113, 120337, 127, 13583, 121214, 120367, 120369, 121222, 167, 185, 195, 121121, 121266, 120401, 121232, 13643, 13649, 13773, 13949, 13983, 120923, 120445, 120451, 120457, 120540, 14125, 14129, 121137, 14137, 121139, 120586, 120588, 121234, 14165, 121150, 121268, 120967, 120975, 14201, 120979, 120634, 120642, 120995, 14249, 120662, 14259, 14261, 121174, 13001, 121007, 120670, 14281, 14283, 13033, 13071, 120680, 121182, 121051, 121184, 13091, 121186, 120742, 14375, 120750, 13179, 120754, 121276, 121067, 121071, 121073, 14451, 120768, 14463, 120770, 14477, 13255, 121288, 120776, 121198, 120780, 14543, 14547, 13331, 121202, 120814, 120163, 120175, 120177, 120189, 120829, 120831, 13451, 120833, 13459, 120835, 120839, 120696, 13009, 120782, 14295, 13251, 121075, 120219, 13679, 120877, 120881, 120895, 120931, 121041, 121152, 121244, 121310, 305, 13077, 13085, 13181, 13199, 13257, 13267, 13433, 13675, 13721, 13839, 13843, 13859, 13965, 14035, 14109, 14205, 14209, 120139, 120147, 120215, 120297, 120315, 120347, 120355, 120359, 120381, 120538, 120644, 120690, 120788

# EmoDB

From abstract…

Ten actors (5 female and 5 male) simulated the emotions, producing 10 German utterances (5 short and 5 longer sentences) which could be used in everyday communication and are interpretable in all applied emotions.

The recordings were taken in an anechoic chamber with high-quality recording equipment. In addition to the sound electro-glottograms were recorded. The speech material comprises about 800 sentences (seven emotions \* ten actors \* ten sentences + some second versions).

The complete database was evaluated in a perception test regarding the recognisability of emotions and their naturalness. Utterances recognised better than 80% and judged as natural by more than 60% of the listeners were phonetically labelled in a narrow transcription with special markers for voice-quality, phonatory and articulatory settings and articulatory features.

The database can be accessed by the public via the internet (<http://www.expressive-speech.net/emodb/>). 🡨 link is no good

From <https://www.kaggle.com/piyushagni5/berlin-database-of-emotional-speech-emodb> :

The EMODB database is the freely available German emotional database. The database is created by the Institute of Communication Science, Technical University, Berlin, Germany. Ten professional speakers (five males and five females) participated in data recording. The database contains a total of 535 utterances. The EMODB database comprises of seven emotions: 1) anger; 2) boredom; 3) anxiety; 4) happiness; 5) sadness; 6) disgust; and 7) neutral. The data was recorded at a 48-kHz sampling rate and then down-sampled to 16-kHz.

Every utterance is named according to the same scheme:

* Positions 1-2: number of speaker
* Positions 3-5: code for text
* Position 6: emotion (sorry, letter stands for german emotion word)
* Position 7: if there are more than two versions these are numbered a, b, c ....

Example: 03a01Fa.wav is the audio file from Speaker 03 speaking text a01 with the emotion "Freude" (Happiness).

Table

Description automatically generated

# EmoReact\_V\_1.0

Train-val-test split provided, keeping speakers separated between splits

Discard the split in favor of re-splitting, stratifying by language and dataset (and gender?); speaker gender was unbalanced by split too

multimodal emotion dataset of children between the ages of four and fourteen years old. The dataset contains 1102 audio-visual clips annotated for 17 different emotional states: six basic emotions, neutral, valence and nine complex emotions including curiosity, uncertainty and frustration.

Regan, Mandryk, & Atkins (2007) associate excitement with positive valence and frustration with negative valence and boredom is negative

Lang (1995); Russell, Weiss, & Mendelsohn (1989) – excitement is positive

Carleton (2016); Anderson, Carleton, Diefenbach, & Han (2019): uncertainty is negative

Curiosity gets mixed reviews: van Lieshout, Traast, de Lange, Cools (2019); Shin & Kim (2019); Noordewier & van Dijk (2017)

[Nojavanasghari, Baltrusaitis, Hughes, & Morency (2016)](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Behnaz-Nojavanasghari/publication/305945989_The_Future_Belongs_to_the_Curious_Towards_Automatic_Understanding_and_Recognition_of_Curiosity_in_Children/links/57a6fd0f08ae455e8542cbe7/The-Future-Belongs-to-the-Curious-Towards-Automatic-Understanding-and-Recognition-of-Curiosity-in-Children.pdf) looked at EmoReact and found that curiosity was associated with positive valence. Hill, Fombelle, & Sirianni (2016) also treat it as positive. So for EmoReact, curiosity could be treated as positively valenced.

I was going to treat them all as positively valenced samples, but MELD also allowed for multiple surprise valences. Therefore, surprise will not have a set valence unless no valence score is provided by the dataset.

Not all emotions in the paper are in the dataset labels… because of v1?

Present: curiosity, excitement, happiness, uncertainty, surprise, disgust, fear, frustration

missing: exploration, confusion, anxiety, attentiveness, anger, sadness, embarrassment

regarding annotating speaker identity, the paper cites Florian et al. as reference #47, but the 47th reference is Schroff, Kalenichenko, & Philbin 2015: “A unified embedding for face recognition and

clustering.”, which doesn’t sound like it’s about annotating speaker identity/gender. There was no other Florian in the references, so I can’t trace this method.

Anyways, I’m manually annotating gender of the child subjects myself, mostly using the thumbnails and listening to the audio when I’m not as sure

Sometimes it’s the adult interviewer’s voice, not the child subject; sometimes both. It is unclear whether the label votes are for the interviewer or child subject in these cases, so where I identified it, I manually omit the observation: VCR107\_2.mp4, BULLYING27\_2.mp4, GAMEBOY19\_2.mp4, GAMEBOY29\_2.mp4, KIMCHI65\_2.mp4, OLDCOMPUTERS128\_2.mp4, TYPEWRITERS19\_2.mp4, TYPEWRITERS28\_2.mp4. I didn’t check every single one, however. The interviewer is usually (always?) male sounding. REBECCA13\_2.mp4 is just ambient music.

A lot of them have interviewer speech

Some are non-verbal vocalizations

Every sample has a valence rating

Multiple ethnicities, NA English

I went back and manually labeled speaker IDs for this dataset too. No speaker appears in more than one split folder. There are supposed to be 21 unique speakers per split folder

This took forever but was necessary in order not to leak speakers between splits

I tried my best but tbh I wasn’t always 100% sure

Fuzzy votes…

Perceived emotion neutral + perceived valence non-zero ::> unk, +/- 1 (perceived valence)

Perceived valence 0 + perceived emotion non-neutral ::> perceived emotion, +/- 1 (valence of perceived emotion)

Basically, records were discarded only if the valence of a perceived emotion w/ unambiguous valence is cross-aligned with the perceived valence. Unaligned (but not cross aligned) records were aligned.

# Emotional\_EMA

From readme…

‘’’

This Electromagnetic Articulography (EMA) database includes articulatory motions recorded by an EMA system.

Talkers produced simulated (acted) emotional speech.

A set of 10 sentences was commonly used for speech recording of a male (AB) and two females (JN, LS), who are native speakers of American English.

On top of the 10 sentences, there are 4 additional sentences used for recording by only AB.

Each sentence was produced five times for four different emotions, such as neutrality, anger, sadness and happiness.

In totol, AB produced 280 utterances (14 sentences x 5 repetitions x 4 emotions), and JR and JN produced 200 utterances (10 sentences x 5 repetitions x 4 emotions).

Each utterance was digitalized in 12-bit amplitude resolution with 16kHz sampling rate.

Speech was recorded simultaneously by the EMA system so that speech and corresponding articulatory movements are aligned in time.

‘’’

Created valence\_scores\_per\_sample from DocumentationEma.txt

In DocumentationEma.txt, there were two filenames misspelled:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 4EMO\_~43.WAV | = | 4emo\_ls\_angry\_41\_041.wav |
| 4EMO\_~86.WAV | = | 4emo\_ls\_happy\_32\_032.wav |

For the emotion category votes, each sample obtained a majority vote for one category (3/4 or 4/4 votes). All of these matched the intended emotion. These were from the best\_xxx\_files.txt files.

Samples were also rated on valence separately (different evaluators). These ratings didn’t always match the valence of the intended emotion. I kept the samples where either the majority valence vote (if present) or the average valence rating matched the valence of the intended emotion. I allowed both criteria to increase the number of samples retained. 32 samples were discarded because of perceived-intended mismatch.

The best\_xxx\_files.txt files do not contain all the files listed in DocumentationEma.txt! The leftovers were assessed by valence only.

Discarded 58

# EmoV-DB\_sorted

Belgian French and North American English

elicitation prompts based on CMU Arctic (en) and SIWIS (fr)

The download link I got only has 4 out of the 5 speakers mentioned in the paper.

The French speaker is missing, so all samples are English…

# enterface\_db

“46 subjects were invited to react to six different situations, each of them eliciting one of the following emotions: happiness, sadness, surprise, anger, disgust and fear.”

“Two human experts decided whether or not the subject had expressed itself in such a way that an untrained human observer could without ambiguity recognize the emotion present in the reaction, for each of the emotions to be elicited. In a post-processing step, samples in which the emotion was not clearly recognized were discarded, so that the database would only contain video samples carrying relevant affective information. In this postprocessing step, decision was made to remove 4 subjects whose none of the video samples carried a believable affective message”

“The final version of the database thus contains 42 subjects, coming from 14 different nationalities.”

“Among the 42 subjects, a percentage of 81% were men, while the remaining 19% were women.”

“The recordings lasted for two weeks. All the experiments were driven in English. Each subject was told to listen to six successive short stories, each of them eliciting a particular emotion. They had then to react to each of the situations and two human experts judged whether the reaction expressed the emotion in an unambiguous way. If this was the case, the sample was added to the database. If not, it was discarded”

“Eventually, the database consists of a total of 1166 video sequences. Out of these 1166 video sequences, 264 concern women recordings (23%) and 902 men recordings (77%).”

Some of these .avi files are quite long, over 1.5 min. in some cases; there may need to be a downstream check

File Naming anomalies for some of subject 3 and subject 11 and subject 6

Subject 11 files are mislabeled as subject 12 files

Subject 11 and 12 and both male speakers

I labeled the speaker genders myself.

# Emotional Speech Dataset

English and Mandarin Chinese

“The dataset consists of 350 parallel utterances with an average duration of 2.9 seconds spoken by 10 native English and 10 native Mandarin speakers. For each language, the dataset consists of 5 male and 5 female speakers in five emotions summarized as follows: 1) happy, 2) sad, 3) neutral, 4) angry, and 5) surprise. Speech data are sampled at 16 kHz and saved in 16 bits.”

I manually labeled speaker gender

Speakers 1-10 are mandarin speakers, 11-20 are English speakers

As a native speaker of both languages, it really sounds like PRC Mandarin and US English to me

# EYASE

“In this work, an Egyptian Arabic speech emotion database is pre- sented that includes four different emotions: angry, happy, neutral and sad. The introduced database includes a total of 579 speech utterances for 3 male and 3 female subjects”

“In this work, an Egyptian Arabic semi-natural emotion speech database is created from the award winning Egyptian drama series Hatha Al-Masaa ( ) ( “Hatha Almasaa ”). Four basic emotions were considered in the introduced Egyptian Arabic speech emotion (EYASE) database: angry (A), happy (H), neutral (N) and sad (S). The EYASE database was recorded for three male and three female lead professional actors. At the time of filming, the actors were within the age range from 22 to 45 years old and had between 12 and 22 years of professional experience, with the exception of the youngest female actor who had about six years of acting experience. Initially, sound clips were recorded and labelled based on visual, audio and story narrative as well as on the depicted actor emotion.”

“In this work, a semi-natural Egyptian Arabic speech emotion (EYASE) database was introduced that includes 579 utterances from 3 male and 3 female pro- fessional actors for the angry, happy, neutral and sad emotions.”

# jl-corpus

New Zealand English

“…the speech was recorded from 4 speakers. All the speakers (two male and two female) were trained voice actors (two current broadcasters, one broadcasting tutor and one broadcasting trainee) of New Zealand English”

“The speech signal was sampled at 44.1kHz and stored as 16-bit numbers.”

“In total, there are 4 (speakers) × 5 (primary emotions) × 2 (repetitions) × 15 (sentences) × 2 (sessions) = 1200 primary emotion sentences and 4 (speakers) × 5 (secondary emotions) × 2 (repetitions) × (13 (emotion neutral sentences) + 2 (emotion salient sentences)) × 2 (sessions) = 1200 secondary emotion sentences, making a total of 2400 sentences, with a footprint of 520 MB.”

I only have access to the “unchecked and unannotated” raws. So the emotion code is the intended emotion

Default sample rate: 44100Hz

Encoding: 16 bit PCM

Chanel: Mono

Format: WAV

File naming rule: (Gender)(speaker.ID)\_(Emotion)\_(Sentence.ID)(session.ID)

Chart

Description automatically generated

No valence provided for encouraging, concerned, or assertive 🡪 discard

There actually aren’t any samples labeled as enthusiastic or pensive, so that isn’t helpful

# LEGOv2

All the audio files from 20061122 look funny; not sure if they are usable

Some of these audio clips are very short, not enough room for a full utterance or even a word

Abstract “Data from the Let’s Go Bus Information System from the Carnegie Mellon University in Pittsburgh has been formatted, parameterized and annotated with quality, emotion, and task success labels containing 347 dialogs with 9,083 system-user exchanges.”

Text

Description automatically generated

“We further introduce the negative emotional state of the user that is manually annotated by a human rater who chooses one of the labels garbage, non-angry, slightly angry, very angry for each single user turn. From all 4,832 user turns, 68.5% were non-angry, 14.3% slightly angry, 5.0% very angry and 12.2% contained garbage, i.e., non-speech events.”

The “neutral” labels are really labels for “non-angry”. Therefore, the valence of these is ambiguous. We will have to discard these.

I keep the slightly and very angry samples as angry samples: 797 angry samples

# MELD

Data are clips from *Friends*

This dataset allows for negative surprise and positive surprise. What the authors describe here as sentiment closely matches the idea of valence.

“The MELD dataset has evolved from the EmotionLines dataset developed by Chen et al. (2018). EmotionLines contains dialogues from the popular sitcom Friends, where each dialogue contains utterances from multiple speakers. EmotionLines was created by crawling the dialogues from each episode and then grouping them based on the number of utterances in a dialogue into four groups of [5, 9], [10, 14], [15, 19], and [20, 24] utterances respectively. Finally, 250 dialogues were sampled randomly from each of these groups, resulting in the final dataset of 1,000 dialogues.”

“The utterances in each dialogue were annotated with the most appropriate emotion category. For this purpose, Ekman’s six universal emotions (Joy, Sadness, Fear, Anger, Surprise, and Disgust) were considered as annotation labels. This annotation list was extended with two additional emotion labels: Neutral and Non-Neutral.”

5 mTurk raters

“We format the audio files as 16-bit PCM WAV files for further processing.”

“These scenarios justify both context and multimodality to be important aspects for emotion recognition in conversation.” <- context and multimodality will be unavailable to me

“...we use seven emotions for the annotation, i.e., anger, disgust, fear, joy, neutral, sadness, and surprise, across the training, development, and testing splits (see Table 4). It can be seen that the emotion distribution in the dataset is expectedly non-uniform with the majority emotion being neutral. We have also converted these fine-grained emotion labels into more coarse-grained sentiment classes by considering anger, disgust, fear, sadness as negative, joy as positive, and neutral as neutral sentiment-bearing class. Surprise is an example of a complex emotion which can be expressed with both positive and negative sentiment. The three annotators who performed the utterance annotation further annotated the surprise utterances into either positive or negative sentiment classes.”

“Multiple infrequent speakers (< 1% utterances) are grouped as Others.”

Table

Description automatically generatedChart, bar chart

Description automatically generated

Some actual dev files are missing from dev\_sent\_emo.csv

Train file count matches

“non-neutral” was not present in datasets.yaml. I think the authors recoded the EmotionLines data with multimodal context.

5 test files were present in the dataset but missing from datasets.yaml:

MELD.Raw/test/output\_repeated\_splits\_test/dia93\_utt5.mp4

MELD.Raw/test/output\_repeated\_splits\_test/dia93\_utt6.mp4

MELD.Raw/test/output\_repeated\_splits\_test/dia93\_utt7.mp4

MELD.Raw/test/output\_repeated\_splits\_test/dia108\_utt1.mp4

MELD.Raw/test/output\_repeated\_splits\_test/dia108\_utt2.mp4

All are in the test split

All are from dialogue #93 (x3) or #108 (x2)

I compared the records from ./test\_sent\_emo.csv and ./ MELD.Raw/test/test\_sent\_emo.csv for dialogues #93 and #108 and the were the same (but for some special punctuation characters). In fact, the five files above were missing from both as well.

Here’s what’s up with these

dia108\_utt1 and dia108\_utt1 are identical: I dunno Monica it feels funny just being here.

They also match dia108\_utt0, which was not missing. The text transcription of the utterance is incorrect in datasets.yaml, but this is irrelevant for me since the emotion label seems fine.

Context: “When Monica buys a new bed from Janice's ex-husband's store, she doesn't get the bed she expected. Meanwhile, Rachel and Ross go out for dinner with her father, and Joey teaches a soap opera acting class.” <https://tvquot.es/friends/the-one-with-the-race-car-bed/>

“Phoebe: **I don't know, Monica. It feels funny just being here.** If you buy a bed from Janice's ex-husband, it's like betraying Chandler.

Monica: Not at these prices.”

A picture containing person

Description automatically generated Phoebe looks disgusted to me?

The valence label is definitely alright anyways.

Anyways, there shouldn’t be a problem with this sample.

dia93\_utt5 and dia93\_utt6 were identical. dia93\_utt7 had no audio.

They were also identical to dia93\_utt4: “I don’t want to talk to you, Wayne. I hate you. You ruined my life.” Joey sounds pretty angry:

A person with his arms crossed

Description automatically generated with medium confidence

The label for test/dia93\_utt4 in datasets.yaml is incorrect! On inspection, the test/dia93\_utt8 and test/dia93\_utt9 videos are identical. The actual dialogue in this self-same footage is the concatenation of Joey’s utterances from dia93\_utt8 and dia93\_utt9 in datasets.yaml (plus a little Chandler speech not noted). dia93\_utt8 dia93\_utt9 of the test split are both neutral (emotion and valence) Joey utterances.

Some of the timestamps in this dataset aren’t great. For example, some samples contain more laugh track than any speech audio although the corresponding datasets.yaml entry says there should be words.

test/dia93\_utt10 is one of those that only has laugh track. The utterance transcription is not present in the audio.

Actions taken:

dia93\_utt4 manually recoded: emotion ang, sentiment negative, speaker Joey

dia93\_utt9 and dia93\_utt10 specifically discarded

some of the samples in this dataset may have multiple speakers saying the same thing in unison. I kept these since ostensibly the valence is expressed in unison too

I manually annotated speaker gender. Luckily, I’ve seen the show and can Google a lot of the characters. A lot of the names are unambiguously gendered anyways

e.g. <https://friends.fandom.com/wiki/Dr._Harad>

“Dr. Leedbetter” is a typo for “Dr. Ledbetter” (speakers)

The Stripper is from s04e22 (F)

These laugh tracks might be problematic.

“a waiter” and “the waiter” are the same speaker

I’m generally assuming that the same speaker label appearing in the same episode is actually the same speaker.

Test/dia71\_utt1 and Test/dia71\_utt2 videos are identical. dia71\_utt2 has the correct annotation in datasets.yaml, so Test/dia71\_utt1 is manually excluded.

I had to merge some identities like “Ross and Joey” with “Joey and Ross”.

Some of the video begin/end timings are so off they ruin the sample. Consider train/dia503\_utt10. Sentiment and emotion match the text and speaker. But the actual mp4 contains the next speaker’s utterance, which is clearly negatively valenced. I didn’t go searching for these, but this one I manually omitted.

Train/dia715\_utt0 is mislabeled. Phoebe: “Thank you! Thanks, Mon. Oh but Mon, if you touch my guitar… [one more time…]” is the actual audio. It’s mostly positive, but it looks like it’s transitioning to negative. This is too ambiguous, so I discard it.

5 dev files were present in the dataset but not in datasets.yaml:

MELD.Raw/dev\_splits\_complete/dia49\_utt4.mp4

MELD.Raw/dev\_splits\_complete/dia49\_utt5.mp4

MELD.Raw/dev\_splits\_complete/dia66\_utt9.mp4

MELD.Raw/dev\_splits\_complete/dia66\_utt10.mp4

Dev/dia66\_utt9 and dev/ dia66\_utt10 are darn near identical to dev/ dia66\_utt8, which is coded just fine. dia66\_utt9 and dia66\_utt10 are dropped

dia49\_utt4 and dia49\_utt5 are identical. It’s from an angry exchange between Ross and Susan:

ROSS: Please. This is so your fault.

SUSAN: How, how is this my fault?

ROSS: Look, Carol never threw me out of her room before you came along.

SUSAN: Yeah? Well, there's a lot of things Carol never did before I came along.

**ROSS: You tryin' to be clever?**

**SUSAN: You know what your problem is? You are so threatened by me.**

ROSS: Oh, I'm threatened by you?

SUSAN: Yes.

PHOEBE: Hey, hey, ok, all right, that's it!

That’s clearly angry talk that sounds angry.

action: dev/dia49\_utt4 manually coded: emotion ang, sentiment negative, speaker Ross and Susan (unique), gender u; dev/dia49\_utt5 ignored

there are two dia201\_utt1, one in train and another in test

dia4\_utt1 exists in all 3

train/dia4\_utt1 has usable no audio

the annotations for test/dia27\_utt0 and test/dia27\_utt1 are wrong. They are both of a clip of Joey mid-utterance saying “badges” excitedly. The valence is too ambiguous for me, so I’m discarding both of these.

Every speaker named “All” is treated as a new speaker per clip

# oreau2

I’m using version 2 of this dataset, which contains only those that passed a perception check

I don’t think the speaker table at the end of Documentation.docx is fully accurate.

“32 speakers (8 female and 24 male), between the ages of 22 and 27, were participated in the design of Oréau database”

79 quotidian sentences

Actual file nomenclature:

<speaker\_gender>/sess<emo\_char>/<speaker\_##>a<utterance\_##><EMO\_CHAR>a.wav

Example: f/sessp/11a06Pa.wav

Speaker gender is f

Emotion is fear (peur)

Speaker #11

Utterance #6

“Utterances recognised better than 50% and judged as natural by listeners were retained, which constitutes the second version of database (OréauFR\_02).”

Surprise is negative for these

Not too many surprises in this dataset

# ravdess

abstract: “The RAVDESS is a validated multimodal database of emotional speech and song. The database is gender balanced consisting of 24 professional actors, vocalizing lexically-matched statements in a neutral North American accent. Speech includes calm, happy, sad, angry, fearful, surprise, and disgust expressions, and song contains calm, happy, sad, angry, and fearful emotions. Each expression is produced at two levels of emotional intensity, with an additional neutral expression. All conditions are available in face-and-voice, face-only, and voice-only formats. The set of 7356 recordings were each rated 10 times on emotional validity, intensity, and genuineness. Ratings were provided by 247 individuals who were characteristic of untrained research participants from North America. A further set of 72 participants provided test-retest data. High levels of emotional validity and test-retest intrarater reliability were reported. Corrected accuracy and composite "goodness" measures are presented to assist researchers in the selection of stimuli. All recordings are made freely available under a Creative Commons license and can be downloaded at <https://doi.org/10.5281/> zenodo.1188976.”

“Filename convention. Each RAVDESS file has a unique filename. The filename consists of seven two-digit numerical identifiers, separated by hyphens (e.g., 02-01-06-01-02-01-12. mp4). Each two-digit numerical identifier defines the level of a different experimental factor. The identifiers are ordered: Modality±Channel±Emotion±Intensity±Statement±Repetition±Actor.mp4 or .wav. The numerical coding of levels is described in Table 1. For example, the filename ª02-01-06-01-02-01-12.mp4º refers to: Video-only (02)±Speech (01)±Fearful (06)± Intensity normal (01)±Statement ªdogsº (02)±First repetition (01)±Twelfth actor, female (12).”

Table

Description automatically generated

“The gender of the actor is coded by the actor's number, where odd numbered actors are male, even numbered actors are female.”

“Experimental design. The RAVDESS contains 7356 recordings of 24 actors (12 male, 12 female). All actors produced 104 distinct vocalizations, consisting of 60 spoken utterances and 44 sung utterances. Each of the 104 vocalizations was exported to create three separate modality conditions: audio-video (face and voice), video-only (face, but no voice), and audio-only (voice, but no face). This produced 312 files per actor (104 × 3). The song recordings of one female participant were lost due to technical issues (132 files). Thus, 24 × 312±132 = 7356 files. This set is composed of 4320 speech recordings and 3036 song recordings.”

“Actors vocalized two distinct statements in the speech and song conditions. The two statements were each spoken with eight emotional intentions (neutral, calm, happy, sad, angry, fearful, surprise, and disgust), and sung with six emotional intentions (neutral, calm, happy, sad, angry, and fearful). All emotional conditions except neutral were vocalized at two levels of emotional intensity, normal and strong. Actors repeated each vocalization twice.”

“This set is composed of 4320 speech recordings and 3036 song recordings”

“Twenty-four professional actors, working in Toronto, Ontario, Canada were hired for stimulus creation (M = 26.0 years; SD = 3.75; age range = 21±33; 12 males and 12 females). Actors self-identified as Caucasian (N = 20), East-Asian (N = 2), and Mixed (N = 2, East-Asian Caucasian, and Black-Canadian First nations Caucasian). To be eligible, actors needed to have English as their first language, speak with a neutral North American accent, and to not possess any distinctive features (e.g., beards, facial tattoos, hair colorings, facial piercings). Participants were also required to identify text presented at 1.5 m distance without wearing glasses.”

“The microphone track for each actor was peak-normalized to -3 dBFS using Adobe Audition CS6. Peak normalization was chosen to retain the natural variation in loudness between emotional conditions [95, 126, 133]. The singing audio track was imported into Melodyne for pitch adjustment to ensure that the three melodies remained perceptually distinct. Intervals are perceived as ªin tuneº when mistuned by up to 35 cents [134, 135], and ªout of tuneº when …”