

Automated HRTF Individualisation Based on Localization Errors in 3D Space

Robin Yonge

August 2017

Acknowledgements

Abstract

With the recent increase in interest in technologies attempting to provide a virtual experience that convincingly replaces or seamlessly integrates with the real world, it is becoming increasingly important to be able to provide an audio experience that is equally true-to-life. A common way of reproducing audio for such applications is through the use of HRTFs or HRIRs, models that capture and describe the various effects that human anthropometry have on an audio signal before it arrives at the inner ear. HRTFs, however, are costly to measure, and it has become apparent that the common practice of using an average or generalised HRTF for every user is insufficient, and can cause significant confusion. This project investigates different HRTF individualisation methods, and attempts to devise and implement a method that would allow users to perform the individualisation process with no additional equipment or expertise.

Table of Contents

Introduction

TODO: sort out subsubsection topics to make it more elegant, fill out notes'd bits, should be ntroduction, can include sections on background, the problem being solved/my motivation, and my proposed solution method.■

Notes:

When HRTFs are applied to an arbitrary signal and presented to the listeners two ears through headphones, he or she hears a virtual target that appears to originate from the location of the original sound source ?e.g., Wight-man and Kistler, 1989b; Bronkhorst, 1995; Mller et al., 1996?.

Present Context

Spatial audio has never been more important. Though there has been a steady stream of interest in applications of spatial audio in fields like defence - primarily applied to Virtual Auditory Displays (VADs)(?) - virtual, augmented, and mixed reality form a large component of the current technological zeitgeist. One major stated goal of these technologies is that of

immersion. This doesn't have to mean that the user feels as if they have been transported to somewhere completely new, they just have to believe in the virtual elements of the experience. Anecdotes about users gingerly walking around virtual holes, or skirting a table that they know was not in the room before they put the headset on abound. No matter whether the technology is designed for entertainment, enterprise use, or to assist, the end user must be deceived into believing in what they are experiencing.

For virtual reality to be convincing, audio must have parity with visuals - just small errors in either can irreparably break immersion (?). [FLESH THIS OUT] listeners often complain that auditory events are spatially diffuse, and listeners often make incorrect judgements regarding the source locations (?) (Wenzel et al., 1993; Miller et al., 1996?.)

In the real world, humans learn to localise sound sources based on a number of cues naturally encoded in the audio signals arriving at their inner ear. The simplest example of which, inter-aural level difference, or ILD, merely refers to the difference in volume between the listener's left and right ears. Cues like these rely on the fact that humans have two ears, that they are binaural, and so the most effective implementations of spatial audio for virtual reality and other similar technologies attempt to

mimic these cues, by filtering audio signals that are mixed down into a two channel audio feed, intended for consumption through headphones.

[CITATIONS?]

Reproducing spatial audio convincingly involves a number of factors, including reflections and occlusion caused by the room and the objects in it. This project however, will focus entirely on the effect the anthropometry of the listener has on the audio signal - the attenuation of the sound caused by the various body parts that they sound waves come into contact with, as well as the inter-aural differential cues such as ITD and ILD.

Modeling Sound Localisation

In most applications involving spatial audio, representing this attenuation is done using Head-Related Transfer Functions, or HRTFs, derived from their time-domain counterparts Head-Related Impulse Responses, or HRIRs. HRTFs are a model for representing this effect on a given signal that the listener's morphology has, and this model can, in theory, be used to convincingly render audio spatially (?). HRIR measurements are taken by placing microphones in the ears of a participant (human or mannequin) and measuring the impulse response resulting when a tone is played from

a loudspeaker (?). This measurement process should be repeated for as many positions/points of origin around the participant as desired, but can involve as many as 1550 source positions in the case of the ARI(?) and SADIE(?) databases. This process is incredibly labour-intensive, requires specialist equipment, and can take hours to perform. As a result, there are few organisations capable of performing these measurements, and generating a set of HRTFs for most individuals is impractical at best. There are a few organisations that have assembled databases of HRTFs or HRIRs, that involve measurements from a range of participants. Typically, the two main differences in these databases are the number of source positions, and the number of participants involved.

Source Positions:

The number of source positions varies from database to database [in the case of CIPIC it is every L degrees from N to M, in the case of ARI, it is every Y degree from X to Z, etc] [add diagrams!]

Subjects:

These databases may contain anything from data from a single mannequin in the case of the MIT KEMAR set (?), to the CIPIC database's 45 subjects (?), up to the 110-subjects-and-growing ARI HRTF database (?).

[table of databases by subjects and participants maybe?]

The Problem

Because of the aforementioned difficulty in measuring HRTFs, data from these databases is commonly used in attempts to implement spatial audio solutions. Either a participant from the database who is deemed to be sufficiently average in their morphology, a selection of participants, or an HRTF set derived from average values for the participants in the database may be used. In the simplest implementations, the audio sample is then convolved with the HRIR, producing audio that appears to come, convincingly or otherwise, from the position in 3D space that the HRIR was originally measured from. The difficult task is then to interpolate between these HRIRs in real time in response to the movements of the user (and

potentially the source too).

The problem with using this data in any spatial audio implementations that are to be used in applications for the consumption of a wide range of end users, is that HRTF data is incredibly specific to the person the measurements have been taken from. Just small differences in the anthropometry of the measured participant and the end user can compromise the efficacy of the HRTF used(?). However, when one tries instead to use a generalised HRTF - derived from the average of a set of measurements, or from a mannequin like the KEMAR(?) - the processed audio is ineffective in much the same way that it is when using HRTFs measured from another person. The KEMAR, by dint of being a mannequin with average features, will not be effective for anyone who is not in possession of a totally average morphology. When using HRTFs that are not well matched to the user, front/back and elevation confusion in particular is very pronounced (?).

It follows, then, that in a system that implements HRTF-based binaural audio, the audio for a user would be processed using a set of HRTFs that matched the user well enough that the resulting audio would enable the user to accurately localise the source of a sound. As we have already established, the traditional method of measuring HRTFs is impractical for

the vast majority of users, which leaves us at something of an impasse. We need a method for producing individualised sets of HRTFs with minimal specialist equipment, an easy user experience that does not require expert knowledge, as small a time investment as possible.

Proposed Solution?

The method that I am proposing would involve modifying an existing HRTF set so as to better fit a particular user, based on data that can be generated by the user, within a virtual or mixed reality environment. This method assumes the user has access to a virtual reality headset/head mounted display of some kind, and the intention is to have the user attempt to locate the source of audio cues that are played to them, within a virtual 3D environment. The data this generates, the difference between the perceived source of the sound and the actual sound source, is what adjustments to the HRTF should be made based upon. This process may then continue until the user starts to successfully localise the sounds sources, or perhaps until the error rate drops below a certain boundary.

This frames the task of HRTF individualisation as an optimisation problem. The goal of a process like the one outlined above being to make

certain values, representing the difference between perceived and actual sources, as small as possible. This is of course the implicit goal of every HRTF individualisation method, but including it as a variable in the process allows us to consider adapting existing optimisation methods solutions[wording?] for use in this context. During the next chapter I will investigate existing algorithms, and attempt to gauge their efficacy.

The next chapter will also investigate some of the existing models for understanding HRTFs and methods for attaining individualised sets, and whether or not they are applicable to the proposed method.

Literature Review

Modifying HRTFs/Overview

This idea of generating individualised sets of HRTFs without having to perform the complex measurements that would usually be required has existed since the 1990s (?). The ideal scenario for commonplace spatial audio involves every user having access to an HRTF set that works for them. If traditional methods of measurements are impractical, then alternatives are necessary.

Methods

Investigations into HRTF individualisation have been done using a range of methodologies, some involving just simple selection tasks (?) and others complex tuning (?) - adjusting multiple parameters against listening tests. Often these methods hinge on a specific model that is used to decompose the HRTF into individual parameters that can be manipulated independently in order to achieve meaningful control over the customisation process. In some cases these models also seek to make clear the relationship between the features of the HRTF and the features of the user - the morphological properties of the measuree being the primary determinant of generated HRIR this seems a logical approach. In these next few sections I will cover the main of the approaches that have been investigated to date, as well as their efficacy and why they are or are not well suited to this project. We will see that there is a definite overlap between these methods, leading to the idea that perhaps in a more comprehensive but laborious model for HRTF individualisation, a combination of these techniques might be used (?).

Database Matching

Database matching is often incorporated into other models for HRTF individualisation. It is based on the predicate that within a database of a given size, there must be a set of HRTF measurements that have been taken from a participant with similar anthropometric features as a given user. This technique has been used in a range of studies on spatial audio, both as part of a wider study on binaural audio and localisation, (?) and as the sole focus of the study (?). As in both of these papers from Zotkin et al, many attempts to match participants with closely matching HRTF sets use measurements of the user's anthropometry, which they will then try to match to the anthropometric measurements taken in the process of assembling the database.

This can work reasonably well, assuming the database used contains measurements from a great enough range of people. The CIPIC database contains anthropometric measurements for all 45 of its participants (?), while the ARI database comes with measurements for 50 of its participants (?). Problems with this method can of course arise when the database does not include measurements from a participant with a morphology that

does not closely match those of the user. The second problem with this method is more of an issue when considering this method in terms of what this project hopes to achieve. Given the my requirements for the customisation method I intend to design, a method that requires precise measurements that would be difficult to perform at home is not ideal. A method that requires precise measurements to be taken has two problems, both in the difficulty of performing the measurements, and the effort that such an act involves, does not satisfy any of my self-imposed standards for user experience.

An alternative method for matching users to their closest-matching HRTF set could be based on subjective listening tests. Playing a user a sample, filtered using an HRTF taken from a database, and asking them to indicate where they believed the sound came from. This process can be repeated for as many examples as are contained in the database, and the one that results in the least incorrect localisation attempts chosen. The problems with this method are again clear, in that the labour required to search all the entries in a database is more than anyone but the most die-hard users are likely to pursue [citation for some human-computer interaction junk about how much effort people will put in?]. Improvements are made on these

kinds of subjective listening tests, however, in attempts to match users to more appropriate HRTFs through the clustering of similar sets.

Clustering

Clustering involves collating a database of HRTF sets measured from different participants, and then sorting these into orthogonal groups based on a specific feature. Fahn and Lo (?) grouped HRTFs based on the power cepstra of each HRTF set. They then used a modified version of the LBG algorithm to form 6 different clusters. Other studies, such as Xie et al (?) found a total of 7 clusters were required. Either way, the idea is to group HRTFs into groups - or clusters - where each HRTF is similar enough to the others in the cluster, but where the differences between each cluster are sufficiently great. The central example can then be taken from each cluster, the HRTF that best represents that cluster or that represents the average, and provide to the end user the example from this set of 6 or 7 that best matches them.

[must state more clearly how successful these approaches are]

Given that clustering is meant to make simpler the process of matching a user with a more personal HRTF set, trying to match users by anthro-

pometry again would be nonsensical. Instead, subjective listening tests are used more often (?). Using this method, the comparative efficacy of subjective tests in this instance is clear versus raw database matching. As opposed to subjecting an undending barrage of tests against 45 or more (as a slightly facetious example), the listener has to compare between 6 or 7. However, the resulting localisation is going to be less precise, given the inherently more generalised approach. The increase in user-friendliness is interesting, though. In lighter-weight applications of VR/AR, perhaps for example on mobile devices, this approach could work. Giving interested users the option to choose between a subset of sufficiently disparate HRTFs, adding a little lightweight customisation. [HOW SUCCESSFUL IS THIS APPROACH????]

(?) (?)

Frequency Scaling

Another methodology is based upon scaling in frequency entire HRTFs or elements of the HRTF. A method that was investigated early on in attempts to devise individualisation methods, it is one that lost out to cluster/database matching methods in the longer run.

Some notable examples of studies into this technique include one by Middlebrooks (?). In this study, they used Directional Transfer Functions (DTFs) which are processed HRTFs with the source location information isolated (?). Initially finding that spectral features from one participant's DTF could be aligned with those of another by scaling. In further investigation participants used DTFs from the other participants, which were then scaled by a range of different factors based on comparisons in the two participants anthropometry - primarily the size of the head, and pinnae. This study then compared the participant's ability to localise sounds convolved with another's DTF against localisation when using the scaled DTFs and found a roughly 50% increase in accuracy with the most effective scale factor.

Another method investigated by Tan et al (?), involved building a tool that allowed users to manipulate the scaling of an HRTF themselves. Given that front/back and elevation confusion is most common when using non-individual HRTFs, they opted to provide options to add a bias towards the front/back, as well as another parameter to tweak how elevation was perceived. Their results showed a small improvement over the non-individualised sets, but the results varied between participants and . Given the simplic-

ity of adjusting a mere two parameters this approach could have been very convenient. But the lack of an impressive improvement in localisation makes it a less tenable solution than some of the others explored, and it is overshadowed by later methods.

Structural Models

Structural models appear to be the most commonly studied models for understanding HRTFs as well as for attempting to synthesise individual sets or customise generalised sets(?). Because HRTFs and HRIRs represent the affects on the sound signal/wave of the features of a human's body, then one should be able to extract and isolate the discrete elements an HRTF that relate to the individual body parts. A German researcher by the name of Klaus Genuit first proposed a model for understanding HRTFs as a series of filters that each represented the effects of a certain anatomical feature (?). The idea of a structural model, or of HRTF individualisation based on a user's anthropometry is pervasive, and many other methods incorporate elements from it. For example the aforementioned 2003 study by Zotkin, Duraiswami, Davis, and Hwang (?) used anthropometric measurements to match a user to closely-matching set of HRTFs from the CIPIC

database. Similarly, later studies centered on Principal Components Analysis - something I will go into in more detail later - look at the relationship between principal components (PCs) and morphological features.

1998 work by Philip Brown and Richard Duda (?) (itself based on a 1996 paper (?)) looked primarily at HRIRs, focusing on the additional temporal information that the frequency-domain HRTFs lacked. The decision to focus on the time domain was to allow them to identify the characteristics of HRTFs that are the result of the different paths to the inner ear that the sound waves took, over time. This study involved only a small number of participants, and so whether or not the synthesised HRTFs produced with this model could replace measured ones is left to more comprehensive studies.

In a 2001 study Algazi, Duda, Morrison, and Thompson attempted to produce an approximated HRTF from the isolated responses of different structural components (?). As with other studies, the synthesis was performed based on anthropometric measurements of the subjects, and the final HRTF composite - made up of the responses of each structural component. This approach was evaluated using a composite HRTF vs a measured HRTF, and when viewed spectrally the two had significant similari-

ties. The study did not go as far as to perform subjective/psychoacoustic tests, however. A similar study in 2003 by Raykar and Duraiswami (?) aimed to decompose the HRTF into a set of significant features that are integral to the localisation of sound sources. Their results were promising, developing an algorithm to decompose a given HRTF, and testing it successfully on every participant in the CIPIC database.

This model often provides promising results, and can be well-suited for applications where a high level of localisation accuracy is required, but a full measurement session is out of the question. The main problem with this method being the precision that is required for the measurements. If an ideal implementation for widespread consumer use relies on a simple calibration process, detailed measurements it becomes more difficult to fulfil that requirement. Investigations have been made into the use of computer vision to automate the measurement process and eliminate human error(?) [find citation again], but unless this process can be distilled into something simple that requires minimal additional hardware (perhaps a smartphone camera), then it is sub-optimal for widespread use.

More recent studies have tried to combine this approach with others, using a combination of PCA and a reduced number of anthropometric

measurements (?). Or a similarly reduced number of measurements to match a set of HRTFs to a subject, then modify them to improve their performance (?). Even trying combination of structural data and a radial basis function (RBF) neural network (?).

Principal Components Analysis

Principal Components Analysis (?) (PCA) is, as it sounds, a process for analysing a dataset and identifying the principal components of that dataset. It is a statistical procedure that attempts to return an efficient representation of the dataset, turning the dataset from some large number of variables, into a smaller collection of principal components (PCs), adding some more efficient structure to the dataset.

Understanding PCA

PCA can be used to reduce the number of dimensions in a dataset, reducing it down to its most basic components. The dimensionality of a dataset is identified by the number of variables present in that dataset. In general terms, for our current example (that of an HRTF set) the data should be represented as a matrix - the structure of the matrix is dependent

on the approach being taken, and different approaches will be explored later in this section. As an example, in the 1992 paper by Kistler and Wightman (?) the data set used was arranged into a 5300x150 matrix. If one were performing PCA manually, this dataset could be then be decomposed into a collection of pairs of eigenvectors and eigenvalues - each pair represented by a line through the dataset at the point of greatest variance. Each pair is comprised of a direction and the variance of the data along that line - the vector and the value, respectively. The number of eigenvector/value pairs in a dataset directly corresponds to the dimensionality of the dataset. The dimensions (eigenvectors) with the greatest variance (highest eigenvalues) will consistute the principle components. The number of principle components chosen from the resulting set is dependent on the level of detail necessary. In the aforementioned Kistler and Wightman study, it was found that 90% of the HRTF could be reconstructed using only the five PCs with the highest level of variance. The Principal Component Weights, or PCWs, are the individual values around an eigenvector - the variance between which gives us the eigenvalue.

Individualising HRTFs/HRIR with PCA

There are a few main differences among studies that apply principal component analysis to HRTFs and HRIRs. Chief among them is whether the study uses HRTFs (?) (?) or HRIRs (?) (?) (?). There are benefits of working solely with HRIRs, one retains the interaural time difference (ITD), and it's easier to extract the effects of subject anthropometry on the resultant HRIR. However when analysing HRIRs with PCA, researchers often time-align the HRIRs before processing (?), losing information on ITD. Estimation of ITD is a comparatively trivial task, and when not relying on an anthropometric model for individualisation the correlation between HRIR and anthropometric features becomes irrelevant. One advantage of the use of HRTFs that cannot be overstated is the larger corpus of research already done on the work (?).

In an early paper on the subject, Middlebrooks (?) found that no matter the database used, the amount of variance described by each PC, and the number of PCs required for a substantial reconstruction of the original HRTF was more or less equal. This is helpful, allowing the results of any investigation into a particular method to be applied semi-interchangably to

new research. The number of PCs used for reconstruction varies a lot, however - anywhere from 4 (?) to 90 (?). The decision as to how many PCs to use depends heavily on the intended accuracy of the reconstruction. The more PCs that are used, the more accurate any reconstruction based on them would be. There are, however, heavily diminishing returns on this number. Many studies are in agreement that using 4-6 PCs can describe around 90% of the variance within the HRTF set (?) (?). It is common to want to reduce the number of PCs used, so as to in turn reduce the complexity of the tuning process (?). When this tuning process is manual, this concern/focus is understandable. But if the process is automated, there could perhaps be a greater focus on accurate reconstruction.

Holzl (?) investigated the effect that different input matrices, created by restructuring the HRTF input data, had when performing PCA on HRTFs. In doing this he identified five different matrix arrangements used by different studies, and found the most effective to be [*(subjects * sound directions) x signal*] - a structure used by Kistler and Wightman in their studies (?).

There is also a difference in how much of the dataset is analysed and adjusted at a time. Some studies (?) [cite a bunch] elect to just adjust

a clustered sub-set of positions, playing a subject a sample from that direction and adjusting just those positions based on that. This process of performing PCA and updating the weights for each position can be time consuming. Other studies (?) use a more global model, analysing all directions at once. For this method to be practical when performing manual adjustments, a method for modeling PCWs can be helpful.

Holzl (?) proposed a method for modelling PCWs based on the spherical harmonics transform. The proposed model effectively maps the PCWs to a sphere around the subject, allowing manipulation of the PCWs that apply to the intended apparent source of the sound being played to the user at a given time. There is a possibility that this approach could allow automated individualisation to be performed more effectively, adjusting the relevant datapoints in a more targeted way.

a little on attempts to match PCs with anthropometry? then how to reconstruct HRTFs and the effect that the modification of PCWs has on the reconstructions and I think I should be good

Search Methods

My proposed method for producing HRTFs is based upon being able to automate the adjustment of the principal component weights produced by using PCA on a generic set. The problem with developing a method for individualisation that works in this way is that there is little in the way of research looking at correlations between localisation errors and principal component weights - which is not altogether surprising. Because of this, I have instead chosen to investigate existing search algorithms that I might be able to fit to this problem. Because of the iterative and interactive nature of this method, any search will be inevitably slow. This is because there is no way yet of modelling or forecasting a user's response to a given HRTF-filtered audio sample. The search methods I will be looking at are all comparatively simple optimisation-focused search algorithms, I have no doubt that with more data regarding error rates and HRTF principal component weights a more sophisticated algorithm could be applied, but for the purposes of implementing a functioning proof-of-concept a simple approach should be taken.

Hill-Climbing Search

The hill-climbing family of search methods (?) start from a given potential solution to a problem, and attempt to find an optimal solution. For our case the steps are so:

- Take a starting state - our generalised HRTF set.
- This state is evaluated - the listener is played a sample and we test how well they can locate the source.
- A change is then made - a predetermined value is added to or subtracted from the parts of the HRTF that corresponds to the direction of the sound source being tested.
- This state is then evaluated again, and the process repeats.

Hill-climbing is notorious for getting stuck in local maxima (?), for example if we were to reach a point at which the user was failing to locate a sound source on their localisation attempts, but changes in either direction resulted in even greater error, a hill climbing algorithm would likely move between those points ad infinitum.

Simulated Annealing

Simulated Annealing (?) search is a simple iterative search method that requires a heuristic that measures how close a given state is to the goal state. The steps the algorithm takes are essentially as follows:

- From a starting state - a generalised HRTF.
- The state is then evaluated by some evaluation function - in this case how close the user got to localising the source a given sample.
- A new pseudorandom state is generated - in this case each PCW would be modified by a random amount, with the degree of randomness depending on the following:
 - If the state was close to the goal state (if the user almost correctly identified the source of the samples) then use less randomness when generating successive states - use a smaller boundary when generating random amounts to adjust by.
 - Otherwise, generate a new state and start from there - allow greater variance in the values that are used to adjust the weights.■
- This successive state - a modified HRTF set - should again be tested

according to the evaluation function, as the process loops.

This process allows for an HRTF set to be individualised using PCA without prior knowledge about the relationship between error rates and principal components. Some adjustments may need to be made, however, in order to increase the efficiency of the algorithm. If information about changes made to states and the error rates they produce is saved, it may help to avoid the problem of pursuing modifications that don't actually get closer to the goal state. Having the ability to roll-back changes could be beneficial. This record of how much PCWs are adjusted and the error rates that are produced by those adjustments may help to add a bias to subsequent adjustments made to PCWs. This could limit the amount of randomness required in the adjustments, and may help the algorithm to achieve its goal state faster.

This method is sub-optimal, because of its loose correlation between the error rates and the adjustments made to the PCs/PCWs. Until those relationships can be studied further, however, it may be an acceptable compromise in order to produce a proof of concept. There is a possibility that the data generated by this project could be used to investigate such a correlation, and as such later updates to the process may be able to

increase its efficacy.

Methodology

Based on the research outlined in the previous chapter, it was decided that an initial implementation of the proposed process would involve modelling the HRTF using principal components analysis to reduce limit the number of variables in play to those that contain the greatest variance. Modifications to this reduced dataset would then be made based on simulated annealing search - or some variation of it. The efficacy of this implementation of this proposed approach will then be evaluated through listening tests conducted within a simple virtual reality environment. The metric for success is the same as the heuristic being used in the individualisation process - does the participant's ability to localise sound sources get better over time, and if so by how much?

Process Notes

For this implementation I elected to follow the model for PCA, along with PCW weight adjustment, outlined by Holzl(?). The core implementation would largely follow his formulation, as mapped out in the paper, with

modifications where necessary. Having a method like this that allows for adaptation of the entire HRTF at once helps to simplify the calculations that need to take place during the individualisation process, a convenience when a lot of the processing is taking place in real time. The input matrix structure that was decided upon during Holzl's investigation, [(Directions x Subjects)(Frequencies x 2)], was modified slightly to work for a single user to become: [Directions x (Frequencies x 2)]. In practical terms, an entry from the CIPIC HRIR database would be transformed into the frequency domain, resulting in an HRTF dataset in the form [Left/Right (2) x Azimuths (25) x Elevations (50) x Frequencies (101)]. This is then restructured into the above form, resulting in a structure [(Azimuths, Elevations (1250)) x (Frequencies, Left/Right (202))] in size. This structure is intuitive in terms of how the original values map to the new one, a quality that carries over even after the structure has been transformed with PCA. Performing PCA on this matrix singles out the frequency bins that contain the most variance over all source directions. The resulting [PCW x PC] matrix maps to [Directions x PCs] where the PCs are the frequency bins of greatest variance and the directions are the PCWs. The benefit of this resulting structure is that it becomes very easy to modify the PCWs that relate to the position of

a sound source. So for my implementation this means that it is simple to map the degree to which a user is able to locate a sound source to a relevant PCW within each PC. Because of this ability to match sound sources with principal component weights, coupled with the fact that PCW modifications were to be automated rather than performed manually, I chose not to model the resulting PCWs using spherical harmonics, further simplifying the individualisation process.

The PCA model produced by this input matrix also allows for around ninety percent of the variance in the to be described by 10 PCs, greatly limiting the number of variables that can be modified. This means that to adjust the perceived source of a sample the algorithm needs to only modify ten PCWs, one for each PCW that corresponds to that source position in each PC.

Core to simulated annealing (SA) search is that the degree of randomness, or the range of potential child states, is reduced as the current state gets closer to the goal state. In this implementation of the algorithm the value that is used to update the PCW is derived from user's localisation error, so the closer the user is to locating the sound source correctly, the smaller the change that is made to the PCW. It is worth noting that this

search method is essentially running many individual searches - either in sequence or in parallel - in order to find the optimal value for every individual source position.

Modifying PCWs like this does mean that generating an individualised HRTF set would take at least 1250 separate measurements, something that is almost as laborious as the standard measurement procedure. So to expedite the process, or at least to affect a greater amount of the HRTF with each modification, the PCWs for the eight source positions directly around the source being tested will also be modified by the same value, halved. This may mean that subsequent modifications partially overwrite previous ones, but it seems preferable to expedite the process at least while data on the relationship between PCWs and localisation errors is so limited.

Because there will be so much time between each subsequent alteration made to a given PCW, the details of each alteration made are stored for future measurements from the same source position. This means that each time the algorithm begins to modify a set of PCWs, it first checks the existing database for previous adjustments. If extant, the previous error value, the modifier value for each PCW, and the change direction

(whether the modifier was added to or subtracted from the weight) are all returned, and can inform this change. The direction of change is informed by whether or not this localisation attempt fared better than the previous one. If it did, then the change is made in the same direction. If it did not, the change is made back the other way. In the event that a change is reversed, this system will ensure that the next change is made in the same direction.

[CONFIRM HOW THE MEMORY ASPECT WORKS, AM I MODIFYING ALL PCWS AT ONCE IN THE SAME DIRECTION BY THE SAME VALUE? OR STORING AN ARRAY OF MODIFICATION VALUES? BE CLEAR]

Implementation

The project that has been produced to test this proposed method is formed of two three parts: A front-end VR test environment that manages the positions of the sound sources and processes the audio samples, and passes data to another module for processing. This individualisation module forms the core of the implementation, as it handles the deconstruction, modification, and reconstruction of the HRTF data. This module is then tied to an in-memory key-value datastore that holds the starting HRTFs, intermedi-

ate results, and an archive of the changes made so far.

Technologies

The bulk of the implementation is written in Python(?), making liberal use of the SciPy(?) set of libraries to handle the majority of processing involved. Also in use is the simplejson(?) module, used to encode both HRTF data and logs extensively. To handle principal components analysis, the scikit-learn(?) PCA class from the decomposition module was employed. Lastly, interfacing with the database was done using the Imdb module(?). Symas' Lightning Memory-mapped Database (?) was chosen both because it is a simple key-value datastore that doesn't require the kind of strictly defined structure a relational database might, and because the entire contents of it can be loaded into memory when the program is started, making fetch and store operations comparatively rapid - useful when working in real-time. Finally, the test environment was produced using the Unity game engine (?), with the GoogleVR SDK (?) and the Final Wireframe (?) shader pack.

Process

Typically the individualisation process would run as follows, beginning with the user or participant in the VR space that is being used to generate the data.

- The user faces a marker signifying the 0, 0 angular coordinate for the CIPIC database.
- The user is then played an audio cue that has been convolved with the corresponding HRIR from a source position that is generated at random but corresponds to a source position available in the database - in the case of CIPIC, this is anything from -45 degrees and up.
- Next, the user should point a reticle situated in the centre of their screen at where they think the sound originated from and issue some kind of confirmation.
- The perceived and actual sound source positions are then passed to the core module.
- This information is then transformed into angular coordinates that match the way the CIPIC data is arranged, from which the update

value is calculated like so:

- maths stuff
- This update value is then used to adjust the PCWs according to the following conditions:
 - If there is no data about previous adjustments, a boolean value is generated using Python's random module(?) to represent the direction of the first adjustment.
 - Otherwise, if the difference between the perceived and actual source positions in the most recent localisation attempt is greater than the previous one, make the adjustment in the opposite direction, if the difference is lower, make the (smaller) adjustment in the same direction.

Analysis

Discussion

Bibliography

Josef Hölzl. *An initial Investigation into HRTF Adaptation using PCA IEM Project Thesis*. PhD thesis, Graz University of Technology, 2012. URL <https://github.com/jhoelzl/HRTF-Individualization>.