

# SWIM: An Attention-Only Model for Speech Quality Assessment Under Subjective Variance

Imran E Kibria  
Computer Science & Engineering  
The Ohio State University  
Columbus, OH, USA  
kibria.5@osu.edu

Donald S. Williamson  
Computer Science & Engineering  
The Ohio State University  
Columbus, OH, USA  
williamson.413@osu.edu

**Abstract**—Speech quality is best evaluated by human feedback using mean opinion scores (MOS). However, variance in ratings between listeners can introduce noise in the true quality label of an utterance. Currently, deep learning networks including convolutional, recurrent, and attention-based architectures have been explored for quality estimation. This paper proposes an exclusively attention-based model involving a Swin Transformer for MOS estimation (SWIM). Our network captures local and global dependencies that reflect the acoustic properties of an utterance. To counteract subjective variance in MOS labels, we propose a normal distance-based objective that accounts for standard deviation in each label, and we avail a multistage self-teaching strategy to improve generalization further. Our model is significantly more compact than existing attention-based networks for quality estimation. Finally, our experiments on the Samsung Open Mean Opinion Score (SOMOS) dataset show improvement over existing baseline models when trained from scratch.

**Index Terms**—speech quality assessment, mean opinion score, self-teaching, subjective variance

## I. INTRODUCTION

Speech quality is a subjective measure of perceived speech that human listeners best evaluate. Environmental noises, reverberation, background speakers, networking systems, and signal processing can degrade the quality of perceived speech since they introduce unwanted sounds and distortions that affect an intended listener. Quality assessment is therefore of significance for evaluating and improving many systems, including those for text-to-speech synthesis, voice conversion, speech separation, and speech enhancement.

Assessment metrics are classified into objective and subjective categories, where objective metrics are deterministic and their examples include Perceptual Evaluation of Speech Quality (PESQ) [1], Short Time Objective Intelligibility (STOI) [2], and Perceptual Objective Listening Quality Analysis (POLQA) [3]. Objective metrics can further be divided into intrusive (requiring a clean reference and degraded input) and non-intrusive (requiring degraded input only) categories, where many well-performing methods are non-intrusive. On the contrary, subjective metrics are dependent on human feedback and their examples include Mean Opinion Score (MOS) [4] and Multiple Stimuli with Hidden Reference and Anchor [5].

This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under grant IIS-2235228, and in part by the Ohio Supercomputer Center.

Recently, researchers have been focusing on modeling subjective metrics (primarily MOS) in a non-intrusive manner, because objective metrics are not strongly correlated with human perception [6] and a clean speech reference is not often available in many real-world scenarios [7]. Also in recent times deep learning architectures with end-to-end optimization have substituted hand-crafted features previously used for quality assessment. However, modeling a subjective metric using deep learning is challenging for the following reasons. First, human-labeled data is laborious and expensive to collect and hence scarce. Second, human labeling is subjective and the same speech signal can be labeled differently by multiple listeners. Third, there exists an imbalance in MOS distribution with average-quality signals being abundant, and very low and high-quality signals much fewer.

Despite these challenges, research in deep learning has led to significant advancements in modeling quality metrics. In architecture design, convolutional architectures have been used, both independently [8] and in conjunction with recurrent and attention architectures to predict speech quality [9]. Using only a convolutional network, the Deep Noise Suppression Mean Opinion Score (DNSMOS) model [10] mapped magnitude representations of speech to MOS using a mean-square error (MSE) objective. Using a hybrid convolutional and recurrent architecture, QualityNet [11] mapped magnitude representations to PESQ; whereas MOSNet [12] and Listener Dependent Network (LDNet) [13] mapped magnitude representations to MOS. Using hybrid convolutional and attention architectures, the Convolutional Context-Aware Transformer (CCAT) model [14] predicted MOS from magnitude representations using the MSE objective, and the Multi-target speech quality assessment network (MTQNet) [15] model predicted MOS from raw waveform using Huber loss. Lastly, Dong *et al.* proposed a hybrid convolutional-recurrent-attention model to directly map an audio waveform to MOS, PESQ, eSTOI, and SDR using end-to-end optimization of the MSE objective [16]. Most of these models have used only magnitude representations as input since phase is unstructured and has historically been considered unimportant for a long time [17]. However, studies have now shown the importance of phase in denoising [18] [19], establishing the waveform input (implicitly containing magnitude and phase) as more informational.




Fig. 1. The architectural diagram of our proposed SWIM model.  $y$  corresponds to the MOS prediction of the input utterance.

In this paper, we propose SWIM, a novel attention-based model for MOS prediction directly using an utterance signal. Our architectural design is inspired by the Swin transformer [20], which was originally proposed for images. We adapt it to speech by configuring the architecture to operate on groups of temporal frames, in contrast to image patches with spatial structure. Swin transformer is chosen for quality assessment because the acoustic properties of an utterance vary in time, and it operates on local windows to capture them. In modeling an utterance quality, we capture local features using Swin transformers and global features using standard transformers. Our model is deep yet compact, featuring 80k trainable parameters which facilitates generalization in sparingly available MOS datasets. For training under noisy labels, we propose penalizing a prediction based on its distance from the dataset label and the quality of that label. It follows from the fact that MOS labels of different utterances have different variances in human ratings. A multi-stage self-teaching strategy further enhances generalization by treating subjective variance as noise in an unknown true label. Lastly, our experiments on the Samsung Open Mean Opinion Score (SOMOS) [21] dataset validate the architecture and show improvement in error and correlation metrics over existing baseline models when trained from scratch.

## II. PROPOSED APPROACH

In the following subsections, we elaborate on our model design, its underlying intuition, and training strategy. Our training is aimed at improving generalization when MOS ratings of an utterance vary between multiple listeners.

### A. Model Architecture

The block diagram of our architectural design is shown in Fig. 1. In the first step, a 1D waveform is divided into small non-overlapping frames each of 1ms. This operation is performed in the wave framing block, the output of which is a 2D representation of frame indices and frame samples for a single signal. The frame size is deliberately chosen as small as it directly correlates with the subsequent model size.

In the second step, a linear embedding layer maps each frame to a latent space of the same dimension. Commonly, positional information is added to feature embeddings before feeding them to a transformer layer since self-attention is a permutation-invariant operation. However, we do not add

any positional encodings to our frame embeddings. We have experimentally observed it to deteriorate model performance. We believe it is because the positional information about sequential structure is more relevant to learning linguistic content in speech. However, the acoustic content is independent of the sequential structure and varies across a sequence. Hence, only frame embeddings are fed as input to the Swin transformer.

In the third step, a Swin transformer captures local dependencies within groups of frame tokens. This contrasts with a standard transformer that captures global dependencies across all input tokens. We elaborate on the working of our Swin Transformer in subsection II-B. Its output has the same dimensions as the input but encompasses local dependencies within groups of frame tokens. We term this group of successive frames as a ‘context’, whose duration is constant in each of our blocks.

In the fourth step, the output of the Swin transformer is fed to a max pooling layer. The 1D max pooling operation merges a fixed number of successive frames in each layer, compressing information across the temporal axis. Our choice of max pooling differs from [20], where a linear layer was used to merge image patches. We have experimentally observed max pooling to perform better. We believe it is for the same reason that a linear layer on top of flattened embeddings of consecutive frames attempts to capture sequential structure. We term a group of embedding or max-pooling layers with a Swin transformer, a local modeling block. A hierarchy of these blocks consecutively reduces the number of frames, while capturing local dependencies within contexts. Our architecture design has  $K + 1$  such blocks, compressing an utterance to only  $n$  frame tokens at the end.

In the fifth step, we prepend a learnable [MOS] token at the start of these frame tokens and feed it to a standard transformer, termed a global modeling block. This standard transformer applies attention across all tokens, hence aggregating acoustic information for the whole utterance. This information is also shared with the [MOS] token during interaction in self-attention. In total, we have  $M$  such standard transformer layers cascaded sequentially.

In the last step, we have a shallow multi-layer perceptron mapping global embeddings corresponding to the [MOS] token to a scalar value. This scalar value is our MOS estimate for the given utterance.




Fig. 2. Swin transformer for speech with 8 frame tokens.

### B. Swin Transformer

The Swin transformer [20] was originally proposed for images, however, we adapted it for speech. We explain its mechanism using a toy example of an utterance with eight frame tokens. The architecture diagram is shown in Fig. 2. It consists of two standard transformer layers stacked one on top of the other. The first layer models dependencies within contexts, whereas the second layer models dependencies within shifted contexts. Shifted contexts ensure that dependencies at context disjunctions in the first layer are also captured.

In the first transformer layer (left portion in Fig. 2), a layer normalization step normalizes features of all frame tokens in the utterance. Next, a frame-to-context operation groups frame tokens into disjoint contexts via a reshaping operator, so only local rather than global dependencies are captured. The multi-head self-attention (MHSA) captures these local dependencies within each context. Following this, a context-to-frame operation reverts contexts into frame tokens via reshaping. A residual term is added to all frame tokens through a skip connection. This result is then passed through a sequence of layer normalization (LN), multi-layer perceptron (MLP), and another skip connection to yield the output of the first transformer layer.

In the second transformer layer (the right portion in Fig. 2), the input is circularly shifted to the left by half of the context size. This shifting ensures that dependencies at disjunctions of previous contexts are now captured in the newly formed shifted contexts. The architecture of this transformer layer is identical to the first one, except for masking during self-attention. It can be observed that the start tokens [1, 2] and end tokens [7, 8] are within the same context in the shifted sequence [7, 8, 1, 2]. We want to prevent modeling the cross-interaction between the start and end tokens because they do not occur together in the original sequence. For this reason, we use a boolean mask to allow only end tokens [7, 8] to interact mutually and start tokens [1, 2] to interact mutually but prevent their cross-interaction.

### C. Training Objective

Commonly, the mean squared error (MSE) or mean absolute error (MAE) is chosen as the training objective for minimizing the distance between the quality label and model prediction. However, in subjective quality assessment, MOS is only an estimate of the true label which is not equally good for all utterances. Therefore, we propose using the Mahalanobis distance between a model prediction and the distribution of human ratings as the training objective.

Subjective ratings of an utterance have a mean value (referred to as dataset label) and standard deviation. Intuitively, two model predictions 2 and 4 for different signals are the same absolute distance from their corresponding MOS labels 3 and 5, respectively. However, if there exists a large variance across listeners in the label value 3 (mean estimate is weak), and no variance across listeners in the label value 5 (mean estimate is strong), then model prediction 2 should be penalized less and prediction 4 penalized more. Hence, we normalize the absolute distance by the standard deviation of ratings and use the log to avoid overshooting when  $\sigma = 0$ . Our training objective is given as

$$l = \log_{10}\left(1 + \frac{|y - \mu|}{\sigma + \epsilon}\right) \quad (1)$$

where  $y$  is the model prediction,  $\mu$  is the mean of opinion scores,  $\sigma$  is the standard deviation across ratings, and  $\epsilon$  is a small constant empirically determined at 0.01.

### D. Sequential Learning

We treat variance in ratings as noise in an underlying true label and also adopt the SUSTAIN [22] framework as in [10]. It was proposed to enhance model generalization on a noisy label dataset. It is a multistage self-teaching process, where a model learning as a student in a given stage, serves as a teacher in subsequent stages. The architecture of the teacher and student model remains identical in all stages. In each stage, our training label is the aggregate of the dataset label and predictions from previously learned models. It is given as follows

$$y_t = (\alpha_0 \cdot \mu) + \sum_{i=1}^m (\alpha_i \cdot t_{i-1}) \quad (2)$$

where  $\mu$  corresponds to the MOS label in the dataset and  $t_{i-1}$  corresponds to the prediction of a model trained in the previous stage and weighted by  $\alpha_i$ .  $m$  is the total number of training stages. In the extreme case when  $m = 1$ ,  $t_0$  corresponds to the prediction of the model trained on the dataset. The sum of all weights  $\alpha_i$  is equal to 1.

## III. EXPERIMENTATION

In this study, we use the Samsung Open Mean Opinion Score (SOMOS) [21] dataset for training and evaluation. It consists of 14100 training, 3000 validation, and 3000 test utterances in English from a single speaker. The signals have been synthetically distorted by varying their prosodic parameters. MOS ratings for each signal have been collected to reflect speech naturalness. Based on spurious labeling, the dataset is

divided into full and clean sets, where spurious ratings were manually removed for the clean set. Our model processes signals that have a fixed length of 20.48s and a 16kHz sampling rate. All signals shorter than this are padded with trailing silence. Our wave framing block divides utterances into frames of 1ms. The embedding layer maps each frame to another space of the same dimension.

SWIM has  $K + 1$  local modeling blocks, where  $K=7$ . We use  $M = 8$  standard transformer layers for global modeling. The embedding dimension and the number of heads across all transformer layers are fixed at 16 and 4, respectively. The MLP for mapping features to a scalar has 3 layers, of which 2 are dense having 16 units each, and the third is linear with 1 unit. For training, we use the AdamW optimizer with a  $10^{-4}$  learning rate, annealed exponentially, and the batch size is set at 8, a small number for good regularization. These values were determined empirically and from the literature.

### A. Architecture and Loss Analysis

We train two configurations of the SWIM architecture, where positional encodings are either included or excluded, and results are shown in Table I. Only fixed sinusoidal encodings [23] are analyzed, since learnable encoding increases model size, making a fair comparison infeasible. It can be observed that incorporating positional information is not helpful to the quality assessment task. This is because acoustic information varies across an utterance and is independent of position. We also analyze the effect of using a linear layer versus a 1D max-pooling layer for merging frames across time within the local modeling blocks. The results in Table I show that the linear layer deteriorates performance, likely because it learns sequential structure across frames in training data, which impacts MOS estimation on the validation set.

Finally, we compare the SWIM model when it is trained using three different loss functions including MAE, MSE, and our proposed objective in (1). The MAE and MSE penalize each prediction based on its distance from the MOS label, whereas our objective penalizes each prediction based on the distance and quality of each MOS label. For each objective, the model is trained from scratch on utterance-level data. The results are tabulated in Table I using the validation set.

TABLE I

PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS OF POSITIONAL ENCODINGS (PE), FRAME MERGING (FM), AND TRAINING LOSS ON VALIDATION SET

|              | Clean Set    |              |              | Full Set     |              |              |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|              | MSE          | PCC          | SRCC         | MSE          | PCC          | SRCC         |
| PE: Included | 0.315        | 0.284        | 0.270        | 0.154        | 0.155        | 0.151        |
| PE: Excluded | <b>0.282</b> | <b>0.370</b> | <b>0.362</b> | <b>0.152</b> | <b>0.296</b> | <b>0.338</b> |
| FM: Linear   | 0.305        | 0.274        | 0.278        | <b>0.148</b> | 0.224        | 0.220        |
| FM: Pooling  | <b>0.282</b> | <b>0.370</b> | <b>0.362</b> | 0.152        | <b>0.296</b> | <b>0.338</b> |
| Loss: MAE    | 0.273        | 0.382        | 0.365        | 0.132        | 0.360        | 0.335        |
| Loss: MSE    | <b>0.269</b> | <b>0.404</b> | <b>0.394</b> | <b>0.130</b> | <b>0.377</b> | <b>0.346</b> |
| Loss: Ours   | 0.282        | 0.370        | 0.362        | 0.152        | 0.296        | 0.338        |

TABLE II  
COMPARISON WITH BASELINE MODELS ON FULL VALIDATION SET

| Model   | MSE ↓        | PCC ↑        | SRCC ↑       |
|---------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| MOSNet  | 0.598        | 0.218        | 0.238        |
| LDNet   | 0.581        | 0.262        | 0.275        |
| SSL-MOS | 0.564        | 0.296        | 0.313        |
| SWIM    | <b>0.130</b> | <b>0.377</b> | <b>0.346</b> |

We observe that the MSE objective results in the best performance, and our proposed objective does not perform as well. Perhaps it is because the error and correlation metrics assign equal importance to all (prediction, label) pairs. In reality, each label is not an equally strong quality representation of its utterance. We will further explore this idea in future work.

### B. Baseline Comparison

We compare against the reported performances [21] of MOSNet [12], LDNet [13], and SSL-MOS [24] on the utterance-level full dataset in Table II. The clean set is not used since the authors used model checkpoints pre-trained on different datasets. Likewise, the study in [25] used embeddings from large pre-trained speech models [26], [27]. For a fair evaluation of architecture only, in which data availability and pre-training do not influence performance, we compare SWIM (MSE objective) to other models when they are trained from scratch using the same data. We observe significant improvements in all metrics over all baseline architectures, the linear correlation improving by 27% over the previously reported best result.

### C. Impact of Sequential Learning

We finally show the impact of sequential learning on noisy MOS labels by comparing SWIM performance across stages. Results for the student model in each stage are shown in Table III on the utterance-level full set which has more noisy labels than the clean set. The MSE objective is used for training since  $\sigma=0$  for teacher labels. The  $\alpha$  values in successive order are (0.4, 0.6) and (0.3, 0.3, 0.4) for stage 1 and 2 respectively. We observe quicker convergence and better performance in successive stages, indicating improved generalization under subjective variance in MOS labels.

TABLE III  
SWIM PERFORMANCE ACROSS SELF-TEACHING STAGES ON FULL SET

| Stage   | Validation Set |              |              | Test Set     |              |              |
|---------|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|         | MSE ↓          | PCC ↑        | SRCC ↑       | MSE ↓        | PCC ↑        | SRCC ↑       |
| Base    | 0.130          | 0.377        | 0.346        | 0.132        | 0.349        | 0.325        |
| $m = 1$ | 0.128          | 0.389        | 0.369        | 0.127        | 0.385        | 0.359        |
| $m = 2$ | <b>0.127</b>   | <b>0.400</b> | <b>0.381</b> | <b>0.124</b> | <b>0.406</b> | <b>0.384</b> |

## IV. CONCLUSION

We proposed a compact attention-only model for modeling speech quality by capturing acoustic information at context and utterance levels. Our architecture improves on existing baselines and sequential learning improves generalization on MOS labels under subjective variance.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. W. Rix, J. G. Beerends, M. P. Hollier, and A. P. Hekstra, "Perceptual evaluation of speech quality (pesq) - a new method for speech quality assessment of telephone networks and codecs," in *Proc. IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, 2001, pp. 749–752.
- [2] C. H. Taal, R. C. Hendriks, R. Heusdens, and J. Jensen, "An algorithm for intelligibility prediction of time–frequency weighted noisy speech," *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, pp. 2125–2136, 2011.
- [3] J. G. Beerends, C. Schmidmer, J. Berger, M. Obermann, R. Ullmann, J. Pomy, and M. Keyhl, "Perceptual objective listening quality assessment (polqa), the third generation itu-t standard for end-to-end speech quality measurement part 1–temporal alignment," *AES Journal of the Audio Engineering Society*, pp. 366–384, 2013.
- [4] "ITU-T Recommendation P.800: Methods for subjective determination of transmission quality," International Telecommunication Union, Tech. Rep., February 1998. [Online]. Available: <https://www.itu.int/rec/T-REC-P.800>
- [5] "ITU-R Recommendation BS.1534-3: Method for the subjective assessment of intermediate quality level of audio systems," International Telecommunication Union, Tech. Rep., October 2015. [Online]. Available: [https://www.itu.int/dms\\_pubrec/itu-r/rec/bs/R-REC-BS.1534-3-201510-1-protect\protect\leavevmode@ifvmode\kern-.1667em\relax\protect\protect\leavevmode@ifvmode\kern-.1667em\relaxPDF-E.pdf](https://www.itu.int/dms_pubrec/itu-r/rec/bs/R-REC-BS.1534-3-201510-1-protect\protect\leavevmode@ifvmode\kern-.1667em\relax\protect\protect\leavevmode@ifvmode\kern-.1667em\relaxPDF-E.pdf)
- [6] X. Dong and D. S. Williamson, "A pyramid recurrent network for predicting crowdsourced speech-quality ratings of real-world signals," in *Proc. ISCA Interspeech*, 2020.
- [7] —, "Towards real-world objective speech quality and intelligibility assessment using speech-enhancement residuals and convolutional long short-term memory networks," *AIP The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, pp. 3348–3359, 2020.
- [8] P. Manocha, D. Williamson, and A. Finkelstein, "Corn: Co-trained full- and no-reference speech quality assessment," in *Proc. IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, 2024, pp. 376–380.
- [9] X. Dong and D. S. Williamson, "An attention enhanced multi-task model for objective speech assessment in real-world environments," in *Proc. IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, 2020, pp. 911–915.
- [10] C. K. Reddy, V. Gopal, and R. Cutler, "Dnsmos p. 835: A non-intrusive perceptual objective speech quality metric to evaluate noise suppressors," in *Proc. IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, 2022, pp. 886–890.
- [11] S.-W. Fu, Y. Tsao, H.-T. Hwang, and H.-M. Wang, "Quality-net: An end-to-end non-intrusive speech quality assessment model based on blstm," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.05344*, 2018.
- [12] C.-C. Lo, S.-W. Fu, W.-C. Huang, X. Wang, J. Yamagishi, Y. Tsao, and H.-M. Wang, "Mosnet: Deep learning based objective assessment for voice conversion," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.08352*, 2019.
- [13] W.-C. Huang, E. Cooper, J. Yamagishi, and T. Toda, "Ldnet: Unified listener dependent modeling in mos prediction for synthetic speech," in *Proc. IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, 2022, pp. 896–900.
- [14] Y. Liu, L.-C. Yang, A. Pawlicki, and M. Stamenovic, "Ccatmos: Convolutional context-aware transformer network for non-intrusive speech quality assessment," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.02577*, 2022.
- [15] R. E. Zezario, B.-R. B. Bai, C.-S. Fuh, H.-M. Wang, and Y. Tsao, "Multi-task pseudo-label learning for non-intrusive speech quality assessment model," in *Proc. IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, 2024, pp. 831–835.
- [16] Z. Zhang, P. Vyas, X. Dong, and D. S. Williamson, "An end-to-end non-intrusive model for subjective and objective real-world speech assessment using a multi-task framework," in *Proc. IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, 2021, pp. 316–320.
- [17] D. Wang and J. Lim, "The unimportance of phase in speech enhancement," *IEEE Transactions on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, pp. 679–681, 1982.
- [18] Z. Zhang, D. S. Williamson, and Y. Shen, "Investigation of phase distortion on perceived speech quality for hearing-impaired listeners," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.14986*, 2020.
- [19] D. S. Williamson, Y. Wang, and D. Wang, "Complex ratio masking for monaural speech separation," *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, pp. 483–492, 2015.
- [20] Z. Liu, Y. Lin, Y. Cao, H. Hu, Y. Wei, Z. Zhang, S. Lin, and B. Guo, "Swin transformer: Hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows," in *Proc. IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021, pp. 10 012–10 022.
- [21] G. Maniati, A. Vioni, N. Ellinas, K. Nikitaras, K. Klapsas, J. S. Sung, G. Jho, A. Chalamandaris, and P. Tsiakoulis, "Somos: The samsung open mos dataset for the evaluation of neural text-to-speech synthesis," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.03040*, 2022.
- [22] A. Kumar and V. Ithapu, "A sequential self teaching approach for improving generalization in sound event recognition," in *Proc. PMLR International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2020, pp. 5447–5457.
- [23] A. Vaswani, "Attention is all you need," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.03762*, 2017.
- [24] E. Cooper, W.-C. Huang, T. Toda, and J. Yamagishi, "Generalization ability of mos prediction networks," in *Proc. IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, 2022, pp. 8442–8446.
- [25] A. Vioni, G. Maniati, N. Ellinas, J. S. Sung, I. Hwang, A. Chalamandaris, and P. Tsiakoulis, "Investigating content-aware neural text-to-speech mos prediction using prosodic and linguistic features," in *Proc. IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, 2023, pp. 1–5.
- [26] J. Shen, Y. Jia, M. Chrzanowski, Y. Zhang, I. Elias, H. Zen, and Y. Wu, "Non-attentive tacotron: Robust and controllable neural tts synthesis including unsupervised duration modeling," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.04301*, 2020.
- [27] D. Jacob, M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova, "Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding," in *Proc. North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, 2019, p. 2.