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- Single best system in post-analysis of ABC (Agnitio+BUT+CRIM) NIST SRE 2010 submission was Full covariance UBM with the state-of-the-art scheme iVector + PLDA
- Do we really need full-covariance matrices?
- Let us take a look at some analysis


## iVector + PLDA

- iVector extractor - model similar to JFA, where GMM mean supervector

$$
\boldsymbol{\mu}=\mathbf{m}+\mathbf{T i}
$$

is constrained to leave in single subspace $\mathbf{T}$ spanning both speaker and channel variability $\rightarrow$ no need for speaker labels to train $\mathbf{T}$
iVector - point estimate of $\mathbf{i}$ - can now be extracted for every recording as its low-dimensional, fixed-length representation (typically 400 dimensions)

- contains information about both speaker and channel
- are assumed to be normal distributed
- Natural choice is simplified JFA model with only single Gaussian. Such model is known as PLDA and is described by familiar equation.

$$
\mathbf{i}=\mathbf{m}+\mathbf{V} \mathbf{y}+\mathbf{U} \mathbf{x}+\epsilon
$$

- PLDA has nice interpretation in face verification where it was introduced by Simon J.D. Prince
- Each face image i can be constructed by adding
- mean face $\mathbf{m}$
- linear combination of basis V corresponding to between-individual variability (moving from $\mathbf{m}$ in these directions gives us images that look like different people)
inear combination of basis $\mathbf{U}$ corresponding to within-individual variability (moving from $\mathbf{m}$ in these directions gives us images that looks like differen pictures of the same person)
- residual noise vector $\epsilon$

- Gausian PLDA - assume standard normal prior for iVectors
- Heavy tailed PLDA - assume student's-t distribution prior for iVectors


Motivations for full covariance GMM:
Better description of feature space while preserving reasonable size of GMM mean supervector
Higher computational complexity $\rightarrow$ investigation into possible simplifications
Full covariance Gaussians are more sensitive to very low values of off diagonal elements -> variance flooring:

Function: $\tilde{S}=$ floor $(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{F})$
. $\left.\mathrm{T} \leftarrow \mathrm{L}^{-1} \mathbf{S} \mathrm{~S}^{-1}\right)^{T}$ Tecomposition)
3. $\mathrm{T}=\mathrm{UDU}^{T}$ (Eigenvalue Decompotitee matrix)
3. $\mathrm{T}=\mathrm{UDU}^{T}$ (Eizenvalue Decomposition - diagonal-
4. Set diagonal matrix $\overline{\mathrm{D}}$ to D floored to 1 , i.e. $\tilde{d}_{i i}=$
5. $\tilde{\mathbf{T}} \leftarrow \mathrm{UDU}^{T}$ (making the matrix full again)
6. $\tilde{\mathrm{S}} \leftharpoondown \mathbf{L I ̃ L ^ { T }}$ (de-normalization)



Experimental Setup

## Features: MFCC 19+E, Delta + double delta

Short time cepstral mean and variance normalization over 300frames, Dataset: NIST SRE 2010, Extended core condition 5 - tel-tel, Female only


## Different statistic normalization

Zero order statistics: $N_{\mathcal{X}}^{(c)}=\sum \gamma_{t}^{(c)} \quad{ }^{60}[$
First order statistics: $\mathbf{f}_{\mathcal{X}}^{(c)}=\sum \gamma_{t}^{(c)} \mathbf{o}_{t}$ Centering around UBM:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { und UBM: } \\
& \mathbf{f}_{\mathcal{X}}^{(c)} \leftarrow \mathbf{f}_{\mathcal{X}}^{(c)}-N_{\mathcal{X}}^{(c)} \mathbf{m}^{(c)} \\
& \mathbf{m}^{(c)} \leftarrow \mathbf{0}
\end{aligned}
$$

Normalization:

$$
\mathbf{m}^{(c)} \leftarrow \mathbf{0} .
$$

| $\mathbf{f}_{\mathcal{X}}^{(c)}$ | $\leftarrow \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(c)-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{f}_{\mathcal{X}}^{(c)}$ |
| ---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{T}^{(c)}$ | $\leftarrow \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(c)-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{T}^{(c)}$ |
| $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(c)}$ | $\leftarrow \mathbf{I}$, |




## Amount of training data

- Full covariance | Diagonal cov. | Diagonal cov + HLDA
iVector 400, LDA 150, Norm2, Gaussian PLDA
big = NIST SRE $2004+2005=310$ hours
sml $=3$ hours subset of big se


CONLUSION

- Full covariance UBM gives the best results
- With unity length normalization of iVector you can use Gauss PLDA - Diagonal covariance UBM with MLLT/HLDA goes very close and have benefit of fast evaluation of Gaussians

