Several Improvements to a Recurrent Error Propagation Network Phone Recognition System

Tony Robinson
ajr@eng.cam.ac.uk
CUED/F-INFENG/TR82

30 September 1991

Abstract

Recurrent Error Propagation Networks have been shown to give good performance on the speaker independent phone recognition task in comparison with other methods (Robinson and Fallside, 1991). This short report describes several recent improvements made to the existing recogniser for the TIMIT database.

The improvements are: an addition to the preprocessor to represent voicing information; use of histogram normalisation on the input channels of the network; normalisation of the output channels to enforce unity sum; a change in the cost function to give equal weighting to each target symbol; a change in the representation of the outputs to reduce quantisation errors; retraining on the complete TIMIT training set; and the better estimation of HMM phone models.

Most of these changes decrease the number of arbitrary parameters used and allow for the integration of the system with standard HMM techniques. The result of these changes is a decrease in the number of errors by about 16% (from 36.5% to 30.7% when all 61 TIMIT phones are used and from 30.2% to 25.0% on a reduced 39 phone set).

1 Introduction

It is beyond the scope of this report to describe the recurrent network phone recognition system in full detail. Instead a brief outline will be given and more details can be found in Robinson and Fallside (1991).

A recurrent error propagation network can be considered as a sequence of standard error propagation networks (Rumelhart et al., 1986) with the addition of feedback. The input and output vectors are divided into external and internal portions. The internal output, $x(t)$, forms the state vector and is fed back to the internal input of the next frame, as in figure 1. For practical reasons, training the network is performed by unfolding in time, although other training schemes are possible.

The external input, $u(t)$, to the network consists of 16ms frames of preprocessed speech. A comparison of preprocessors for this task can be found in Robinson et al. (1990). The conclusion of this study was that one power channel and 20 power spectral channels were