


# Experiments

## Speech Declipping



Comparison between different declipping methods




# Experiments


## Speech Enhancement and Dereverberation

Table.13 Performance on declipping task

Clipping Level	0.25				0.10				Average			
Models	SiSNR	STOI	PESQ	MOS	SiSNR	STOI	PESQ	MOS	SiSNR	STOI	PESQ	MOS
Unprocessed	9.60	0.95	2.38	2.56	4.00	0.89	1.51	2.72	6.80	0.92	1.95	2.64
Oracle	-19.94	0.81	2.36	3.44	-19.94	0.81	2.36	3.42	-19.94	0.81	2.36	3.43
Target	/	/	/	3.42	/	/	/	3.49	/	/	/	3.46
GSR-UNet	11.01	0.97	3.54	3.38	7.47	0.94	2.89	3.23	9.24	0.95	3.21	3.31
Declip-UNet	12.45	<b>0.99</b>	<b>3.98</b>	3.38	8.43	<b>0.96</b>	<b>3.40</b>	3.38	10.44	<b>0.98</b>	3.69	3.38
SSPADE	<b>17.43</b>	0.98	3.55	3.34	<b>10.31</b>	0.92	2.12	2.63	<b>13.87</b>	0.95	2.84	2.98
VF-DNN	/	0.76	1.72	/	/	0.72	1.48	/	/	0.74	1.60	/
VF-BiGRU	/	0.81	2.09	/	/	0.79	1.82	/	/	0.80	1.95	/
VF-UNet-S	/	0.82	2.13	/	/	0.80	1.85	/	/	0.81	1.99	/
VF-UNet	/	0.82	2.21	3.38	/	0.80	1.93	3.38	/	0.81	2.07	3.38



(a) Declipping (0.1)



(d) Declipping (0.25)

Hard to distinguish!