ACOUSTIC SCENE CLASSIFICATION USING MULTI-LAYERED TEMPORAL POOLING
BASED ON DEEP CONVOLUTIONAL NEURAL NETWORK
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to improve the performance of AER by using the temporal information. In DCASE 2017, A. Schindler et al. [7] proposed a CNN architecture which harnesses information from increasing temporal resolutions of Mel-Spectrogram segments. In contrast with the work of [7], we focus on how to capture the latent temporal information of the entire audio sample. To achieve this goal, we proposed a multiple layer temporal feature learning framework using CNN features as input, we call it Multi-layered Temporal Pooling (MLTP). Our temporal pooling method can map an audio sequence with arbitrary duration to a fixed length feature representation which can effectively capture the temporal information of the entire sequence. With the employment of Support Vector Regression (SVR) [11], this method is very efficient during the whole feature learning process. After generating the temporal features for all the audio samples, we train a Support Vector Machine (SVM) with the ones on training set to conduct classification on testing dataset. Compared with the baseline system [3], experimental results showed our method brings absolute improvements of 15.2%. More details about our framework will be covered in Section 2.

2. PROPOSED FRAMEWORK

The framework of our proposed CNN based Temporal Pooling method is illustrated in Figure 1. The whole procedure mainly consists of three stages: the frame-level feature extraction for the waveform audio segment, the patch-level FC feature learning using pre-trained CNN model and the high-level temporal feature learning using our proposed temporal pooling method. Once the temporal features for all the audio segments in development dataset are generated, they will be classified with SVM.

Figure 1: Processing of proposed framework
2.1. Proposed CNN Architecture

Inspired by [4, 12], we proposed a CNN followed a VGG style network for our classification task. The model architecture is similar with the one proposed in [12], which is shown in Table 1. Experimental results showed that, when we used the original network setting in [12] on the ASC development dataset, the model overfitting is rather serious. Hence, three modifications had been made to alleviate the overfitting of the model: (1) reducing the filter numbers by half in each convolutional layer and using filters with larger size; (2) enlarging the pooling size of the last max-pooling layer and adding dropout operation to each max-pooling layer; (3) using smaller full-connected layers and removing one of them. With these modifications, the performance of our CNN architecture had significantly improved and the parameters scale had been reduced from $2.3 \times 10^5$ to $3.8 \times 10^5$.

Furthermore, to accelerate convergence, we also performed Batch Normalization (BN) [13] for each convolutional layer and full-connected layer (except for the last FC layer) during training. More details about the network setting will be further discussed in Section 3.2.

Table 1: The architecture of proposed CNN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer Type</th>
<th>Layer Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conv Conv1_1 5x5 (1, 32) - BN - ReLu Conv1_2 5x5 (32, 64) - BN - ReLu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Max-Pooling 2x2 - Dropout (0.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conv Conv2_1 5x5 (32, 64) - BN - ReLu Conv2_2 5x5 (64, 64) - BN - ReLu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Max-Pooling 13x4 - Dropout (0.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC FC3 256 - BN - ReLu - Dropout (0.5) FC4 10 - ReLu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softmax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#param: 3.8x10^5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2. Multi-Layered Temporal Pooling

In this section, we present the main idea of proposed Multi-Layered Temporal Pooling method and how it works in our proposed framework. The performance of an ASC system is highly depending on the discriminative information in the categorical prior knowledge and the latent temporal dynamics of the audio signal. For one training audio sample, the proposed CNN can capture the effective discriminative information from its small patches and label, however, the individual learning mechanism would lose some important temporal dynamics of the whole sequence. Motivated by [14, 15], we proposed a temporal feature learning method based on a regularized SVR to capture the temporal variations in audio signals. As the framework shown in Figure 1, the temporal pooling method takes the mid-level CNN features as the input. Hence, to adequately model such deep learned complex features sequence, we extend the temporal pooling into the hierarchical multi-layered structure, we call it Multi-Layered Temporal Pooling.

For better understanding our MLTP method, a simple MLTP architecture with two layers is illustrated in Figure 2. Let $X_l^0 = \{x_l^{(i)}, \ldots, x_l^{(j)}\}$ represent the input feature sequence for layer $l$. In this temporal pooling layer, we first conduct a non-linear feature mapping $\Phi(\cdot)$ for $X_l^0$, which is used for capture the complex dynamic information contains in the audio sequence.

In our work, we adopt $\chi^2$ kernel and posneg kernel [16] to do non-linear feature mapping respectively. The latter one can be regarded as a simplified version of Hellinger kernel, where the primal form of Hellinger kernel function is given as,

$$K_{hell}(x,y) = \sqrt{x^T y},$$

where $\sqrt{x^T y} = x^T + y^T$. Where $x$ and $y$ represents the non-negative and the negative part of the input respectively. Directly using (1) can bring a very complex kernel, hence, we use the simplified version of Hellinger kernel called posneg as,

$$K_{posneg}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = \|\bar{x} - \bar{y}\|^2 = K_{hell}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}),$$

where $\bar{x} = [x^+ , x^-]$.

2.2. Multi-Layered Temporal Pooling

In this section, we present the main idea of proposed Multi-Layered Temporal Pooling method and how it works in our proposed framework. The performance of an ASC system is highly depending on the discriminative information in the categorical prior knowledge and the latent temporal dynamics of the audio signal. For one training audio sample, the proposed CNN can capture the effective discriminative information from its small patches and label, however, the individual learning mechanism would lose some important temporal dynamics of the whole sequence. Motivated by [14, 15], we proposed a temporal feature learning method based on a regularized SVR to capture the temporal variations in audio signals. As the framework shown in Figure 1, the temporal pooling method takes the mid-level CNN features as the input. Hence, to adequately model such deep learned complex features sequence, we extend the temporal pooling into the hierarchical multi-layered structure, we call it Multi-Layered Temporal Pooling.

For better understanding our MLTP method, a simple MLTP architecture with two layers is illustrated in Figure 2. Let $X_l^0 = \{x_l^{(i)}, \ldots, x_l^{(j)}\}$ represent the input feature sequence for layer $l$. In this temporal pooling layer, we first conduct a non-linear feature mapping $\Phi(\cdot)$ for $X_l^0$, which is used for capture the complex dynamic information contains in the audio sequence.

In our work, we adopt $\chi^2$ kernel and posneg kernel [16] to do non-linear feature mapping respectively. The latter one can be regarded as a simplified version of Hellinger kernel, where the primal form of Hellinger kernel function is given as,

$$K_{hell}(x,y) = \sqrt{x^T y},$$

where $\sqrt{x^T y} = x^T + y^T$. Where $x$ and $y$ represents the non-negative and the negative part of the input respectively. Directly using (1) can bring a very complex kernel, hence, we use the simplified version of Hellinger kernel called posneg as,

$$K_{posneg}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = \|\bar{x} - \bar{y}\|^2 = K_{hell}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}),$$

where $\bar{x} = [x^+ , x^-]$. Where $\bar{x}$ and $\bar{y}$ represents the non-negative and the negative part of the input respectively. Directly using (1) can bring a very complex kernel, hence, we use the simplified version of Hellinger kernel called posneg as,

$$K_{posneg}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = \|\bar{x} - \bar{y}\|^2 = K_{hell}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}),$$

where $\bar{x} = [x^+ , x^-]$. Where $\bar{x}$ and $\bar{y}$ represents the non-negative and the negative part of the input respectively. Directly using (1) can bring a very complex kernel, hence, we use the simplified version of Hellinger kernel called posneg as,
achieve this goal, we use a linear function $f(v_t; u) = u^T v_t$, where $v_t \in \mathcal{V}$ with the parameters $u$ to reconstruct the temporal information, and try to learn $u$ such that $f$ should satisfy the constraint given in (3),

$$f(v_t) < f(v_{t+1}), \quad \text{where } t < t+1$$

(3)

where $t_1$ and $t_2$ are the time indexes of the input sequence. To find this optimal vector, we exploit a point-by-point optimization strategy based on SVR, which makes a direct connection between each $v_t$ and $u$, the formula is given in (4),

$$\arg\min_u \left\{ \frac{1}{2}\|u\|^2 + \frac{C}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[ t_i - u^T v_i - \varepsilon \right]^2 \right\}$$

(4)

where $v_t$ is the feature vector at time $t$, and $t$ is taken as the label, $\left\{ \cdot \right\}_+ = \max\{\cdot, 0\}$ is the $\varepsilon$-insensitive loss function [17], the regularization factor $C$ is a tradeoff between the flatness of fitting function and the reconstruction error tolerance range. When the algorithm meets the convergence conditions, the optimal vector $u$ will be generated as the temporal feature for the input sequence.

For our MLTP, each successive layer captures the temporal dynamics of the output of the previous layer in the sliding window manner, each pooling operation takes the sub-sequence of the input with a fixed length. Hence, we can control the depth of the whole structure and the width of each layer by varying the stride and window size for each layer. According to the experimental experience, a 2-layer MLTP with window size three and stride two is sufficient for our task. After the temporal feature learning, we take the final vector as the representation of corresponding audio segment to train the SVM classifier, and then use it to classify the testing data in the development set.

3. EXPERIMENTS AND RESULTS

3.1. Feature Extraction

Through all the experiments, we convert the audio samples to 48 kHz sampling rate, 16 bits/sample, mono channel (the mono channel samples were generated by averaging the two channels samples). Before training our proposed CNN, we extracted 40, 80 and 120 bands log-mel energies for each converted audio samples respectively with frame size 40ms and 50% overlap. In our work, the frame-level log-mel energies can be regarded as the low-level descriptors, and to obtain the temporal information during the MLTP training, each low-level descriptor should be split into smaller patches with fixed length. Finally, each patch has 50 frames (i.e. 1sec), and patches with three different sizes: (50, 40), (50, 80) and (50, 120) were respectively used as the network inputs to train the CNN models.

3.2. CNN Training Parameters and Results

During training, the initial learning rate was set to 0.1 and decreased in the logarithmic domain every epoch. The training strategy was mini-batch gradient descent based on back propagation with 128 batch size and 0.9 momentum. To alleviate overfitting, the L2-regularization was added to the cross-entropy loss with a weight decay of 0.001, and we also applied dropout [1] after the first, second max-pooling layer and the last full-connected layer with probabilities 0.3, 0.3 and 0.5.

Before training, we first normalized the log-mel energies for each frame, and then we calculated the means and the standard deviations through time on the training set to standardize all the input patches. The input patches used for the training were split with 25% overlap, but during testing, the patches were extracted with no overlap. In our work, the network is used to generate the mid-level descriptors for the MLTP training, hence we only evaluate the networks after 20 epochs with the patch-wise accuracy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Log-mel Bands</th>
<th>Training Set Overlap</th>
<th>Best Acc. at Epoch</th>
<th>Patch Acc. [%]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results in Table 2 showed that, when 120 log-mel bands energies and 25% patch overlap were used, the network achieved the best performance. And by using Batch Normalization for the outputs of each layer, the model can convergence within 20 epochs during all the experiments. Then, we saved the model parameters with the highest patch-size accuracy to extract the mid-level descriptors for the next MLTP training.

3.3. Classifying with MLTP Features

We used the pre-trained CNN model with the best performance mentioned in Section 3.2 to get the last full-connected (FC) layer output for each input patch with 25% overlap in development dataset. Thus, each audio sample there would be represented by a mid-level features sequence formed by these FC vectors. Then, our proposed MLTP method would use this sequence as input to generate the MLTP feature for the corresponding audio sample.

As mentioned in Section 2.2, the MLTP framework is consist of two major components: the non-linear feature mapping and the temporal pooling based on SVR. In this case, we conducted two sets of experiments one by one to find the optimal MLTP configuration for our ASC task. In the first set, we fixed the feature mapping kernel type and SVM classifier kernel function with proposed posneg kernel and the $\varphi^2$ kernel respectively in advance. Under this condition, we attempted to investigate the optimal SVR penalty factor $\lambda$ for the MLTP according to the classification accuracy. Results in Table 3 showed that, when the penalty factor $\lambda$ was set to $1 \times 10^{-3}$, the proposed system achieved the best performance. Then this parameter will be fixed in the following experiments.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Mapping</th>
<th>SVM Kernel</th>
<th>Acc. [%]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>posneg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>73.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>posneg + $\chi^2$</td>
<td>73.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>posneg + $\chi^2$</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>75.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>posneg + $\chi^2$</td>
<td>74.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By using the optimal penalty factor found in the first set of
experiments, we further investigated how different kernel types
applied in feature mapping and SVM classifier effect the per
formance of our proposed method. As the results illustrated in
Table 4, when we combined the two types of kernel: posneg and $\chi^2$
in the feature mapping, the system achieved better per
formance than the cases of using them alone. And the best accurac
ty 75.28% was achieved when the posneg kernel was applied for
the classifier.

To have a better observation about the performance of our
proposed temporal pooling method MLTP_CNN, the class-wise accuracies of the optimal configuration found in the above two
sets of experiments are further given in Table 5. Comparing
with the baseline system provided by DCASE 2018 [3], the average class-wise accuracy had been improved by our method with absolute 15.6 percent.

Table 5: The class-wise accuracy comparison on the develop-
ment dataset.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene Label</th>
<th>Accuracy [%]</th>
<th>Baseline [3]</th>
<th>CNN_MLTP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Station</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Square</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Mall</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Pedestrian</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Traffic</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tram</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>59.7 (± 0.7)</td>
<td>75.3(± 0.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4. Submissions
All the experiments shown in Table 2-5 were conducted with
the default training/testing split of the DCASE 2018 develop-
dataset. To achieve better final evaluation results for task
1, we utilize the full development dataset to our final model.
We submit two outputs for our system using two different SVM
penalty factors: 0.05 and 0.1, which have achieved 70.66% and
73.33% accuracy respectively on the Kaggle leaderboard da
set [18]. The other parameters for the submitted system were
choseed based on the optimal settings found in our previous
experiments on the development set.

4. CONCLUSION AND FUTUREWORK
In this report, we proposed an efficient novel multiple layer
temporal feature learning method for ASC task, which can ef
fectively capture the temporal dynamics for an entire audio data with arbitrary duration. The experimental results on the develop
ment dataset showed that, our MLTP method indeed im
proved the ASC performance. Moreover, based on our experi
ence in CNN training part, the pre-trained model with better performance is more helpful to the proposed framework.

However, for the shortcomings in our present work, there is
still room for improvements. For the MLTP part, we only use
the patches with one second duration, more experiments with
multiple time scale patches should be conducted in the future.
For the networks part, more suitable frame-level features
should be selected, useful data augmentation technology should be considered and better structured networks should be adopted.
Furthermore, the present temporal feature learning process is
divided into two parts, which is lack of simplicity. Therefore,
more concise end-to-end formed framework which can jointly
learn the discriminative information and temporal dynamics
should be proposed in the future.
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