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Abstract—Sound event detection (SED) aims to detect what and when sound events happen in an audio clip. Sound events can be segmented in the time-frequency (T-F) domain and is called T-F segmentation. Many supervised SED algorithms rely on strongly labelled data which contains labels of onset and offset times of sound events. However, many audio tagging datasets are weakly labelled, that is, only the presence or absence of the sound events is known, without knowing their onset and offset times. In this paper, we propose a SED and T-F segmentation framework trained with weakly labelled data. In the training stage, we propose a segmentation mapping applied on a T-F representation of an audio clip to obtain T-F segmentation masks of sound events. We then apply a classification mapping on each T-F segmentation mask to estimate the presence probability of each sound event. Both of the segmentation mapping and classification mapping are trained jointly. In T-F segmentation, T-F segmentation masks can be obtained by presenting a T-F representation of an audio clip to the trained segmentation mapping. In SED, predicted onset and offset times can be obtained from the T-F segmentation masks. We propose to model the segmentation mapping using a convolutional neural network and the segmentation mapping using a global weighted rank pooling (GWRP). As a byproduct, separated waveforms of sound events can be obtained from their corresponding T-F segmentation masks. Experiments on the remixed DCASE 2013 dataset show that the proposed method obtains an area under the curve (AUC) score of 0.948 in audio tagging and 0.893 in sound event detection, outperforming a deep neural network baseline of 0.719 and 0.616, respectively.

Index Terms—Sound event detection, time-frequency segmentation, weakly labelled data, convolutional neural network.

I. INTRODUCTION

Sound event detection (SED) aims to detect what sound events happen in an audio recording and when they occur. SED has many applications in everyday life. For example, SED can be used to monitor “baby cry” sound [1] in the home, and to detect “typing keyboard”, “door slamming”, “ringing of phones”, “smoke alarms” and “sirens” in the office [2, 3]. For public security, SED can be used to detect “gunshot” and “scream” sounds [4]. SED is complementary to video or image based event detection [5]–[7] but has many advantages. First, sound does not require illumination, so can be used in dark environments. Second, sound can penetrate or move around some obstacles, while objects in video and image are often occluded. Third, some events such as fire alarms are audio only, so can only be detected by sound. Furthermore, storing and processing sound often consumes less computation resources than video [8], and as a result, longer sound sequences can be stored in a device and faster processing can be obtained using equal computation resources.

Many SED algorithms rely on strongly labelled data [9] [10] where the onset and offset times of sound events have been labelled [11]–[13]. The segments between the onset and offset labels are used as the target events for training, while those outside the onset and offset labels are used as non-target events [12] [13]. However, collecting strongly labelled data is time consuming because labelling the onset and offset times of sound events takes more time than labelling audio clips for classification, so the size of a strongly labelled dataset is often limited to minutes or a few hours [13] [14]. In contrast to the strongly labelled data, there are large amount of weakly labelled data (WLD), where only the presence or absence of the sound events is labelled, without any onset and offset labels [9]. Fig. 1 shows the waveform of an audio clip containing three non-overlapping events with its log Mel spectrogram, T-F segmentation masks. Strong labelled onset and offset times of sound events; Weak labels.

Fig. 1. From top to bottom: Waveform of an audio clip containing three sound events: “alert”, “speech” and “knock”; Log Mel spectrogram of the audio clip; T-F segmentation masks. Strong labelled onset and offset times of sound events; Weak labels.

In this paper, we propose a T-F segmentation and sound event detection framework using weakly labelled data. This is done by learning T-F segmentation masks implicitly in training with only the clip-level audio tags. It means that T-F masks are not known even for the training set: they are generated as intermediate results. T-F segmentation masks are equivalent to the ideal ratio masks (IRM) [15] of sound events.
in the T-F domain. T-F segmentation masks can be used for SED and sound event separation. In training, the segmentation mapping is applied to the T-F representation of an audio clip to obtain a T-F segmentation mask for each sound event. Then a classification mapping is applied to each T-F segmentation mask to output the presence probability of each sound event. In T-F segmentation, T-F segmentation masks can be obtained by presenting a T-F representation of an audio clip to the trained segmentation mapping. Onset and offset times can be obtained from the T-F segmentation masks for SED. As a byproduct, separated waveforms of sound events can also be obtained from the T-F segmentation masks.

The paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces previous work in SED with WLD. Section III describes the proposed sound event segmentation, detection and separation framework. Section IV shows experimental details. Section V shows experimental results. Section VI concludes the proposed method and forecasts future work.

II. WEAKLY SUPERVISED SOUND EVENT DETECTION

Compared to the conventional SED task, where strongly labelled onset and offset times for the training set are given, the weakly supervised SED task contains only clip-level labels. That is, only the presence or the absence of the sound events is known in an audio clip, without knowing the temporal locations of the events. Several approaches for weakly supervised SED have recently been proposed, including multiple instance learning and convolutional neural network based methods.

A. Multi-instance learning method

One solution to the WLD problem is based on multiple instance learning (MIL) [9, 16]. MIL was first proposed in 1997 for drug activity detection [17]. In MIL for SED, an audio clip is labelled positive for a specified sound event if that sound event occurs at least one time in the clip, and labelled negative if that sound event does not occur in the clip. For strongly labelled data, the dataset consists of training pairs \( \{x, y\} \) where \( x \) is the feature of a frame in an audio clip and \( y \in \{0, 1\}\) is the strong label of the frame, where \( K \) denotes the number of sound classes. For weakly labelled data, features of all frames in an audio clip constitute a bag \( B = \{x_t\}_{t=1}^T \) where \( T \) is the number of frames in the audio clip. Multiple instance assumption states that the weak labels of a bag are as \( y = \max_t \{y_t\}_{t=1}^T \), where \( y_t \) is the strong label of the feature \( x_t \).

The weakly labelled data consists of the training pairs \( \{B, y\} \).

The problem of SED from WLD now can be cast as learning a classifier to predict the labels of the frames \( \{y_t\}_{t=1}^T \) of a bag 
\[
B = \{x_t\}_{t=1}^T.
\]

For the general WLD problem, an MIL frame work based on a neural network was proposed in [9, 18]. In [9, 19] a support vector machine (SVM) was used to solve MIL as a maximum margin problem. A negative mining method was proposed in [20] that selects negative examples according to intra-class variance criterion. A concept ranking according to negative exemplars (CRANE) algorithm was proposed in [21]. However, an MIL method tends to underestimate the number of positive instances in an audio clip [22]. Furthermore, the MIL method can not predict the T-F segmentations from the WLD [9].

B. Convolutional neural networks for audio tagging and weakly supervised sound event detection

Convolutional neural networks (CNNs) have been successfully used in many areas including image classification [23], object detection [6], image segmentation [24], speech recognition [25, 26] and audio classification [27, 28]. In this section we briefly introduce previous work using convolutional neural network for audio tagging [27] and weakly supervised SED.

Audio tagging [29] aims to predict the presence or the absence of sound events in an audio clip. In [30], a Mel spectrogram of an audio clip is presented to a CNN, where the filters of each convolutional layer capture local patterns of a spectrogram. After a global pooling layer [27], fully connected layers are applied to predict the presence probability of each audio class. This audio tagging method is shown in Fig. 2.

However, this CNN only predicts the presence probability of an audio event in an audio clip, but not the onset and offset times of the sound events.

In [31], a time-distributed CNN with a global max-pooling strategy was proposed to approximate the MIL method to predict the temporal locations of each event. However, the global max-pooling will encourage the model to attend to the most dominant frames with the presence of the specified acoustic event and ignore most of other frames. That is, the happening time of the sound events is underestimated. A method by splitting the input into several segments based on the CNNs was presented in [32] for localizing the sound events in an audio clip. It is conducted by splitting an audio clip into several segments with the assumption that part of the segments corresponded to the clip-level labels. This assumption may be unreasonable due to the fact that some sound events may only occur at certain frames. Recently, an attention-based global pooling strategy using CNNs was proposed to predict the temporal locations [33, 34] for SED using WLD.
However attention-based global pooling can only predict the time domain segmentation, but not the T-F segmentation which will be firstly addressed in this paper.

III. SOUND EVENT SEGMENTATION, DETECTION AND SEPARATION FROM WEAKLY LABELLED DATA

In this section, we present a SED, T-F segmentation and separation framework trained on weakly labelled audio tagging data. Unlike the CNN method for audio tagging, T-F segmentation masks for each audio tag are introduced in the CNN, and used later for SED and separation.

A. Training from weakly labelled data

We use only weakly labelled audio tagging data to train our SED, detection and separation model. The training stage is shown in Fig. 3. To begin with, the waveform of an audio clip \( x \) is converted to an input time-frequency (T-F) representation \( X(t, f) \), for example, spectrogram or log Mel spectrogram. To simplify the notation, we abbreviate \( X(t, f) \) as \( X \).

The first part of the training stage is a segmentation mapping \( g_1 : X \mapsto h \) which maps the input T-F representation to the T-F segmentation masks \( h = [h_1, ..., h_K] \), where \( K \) is the number of T-F segmentation masks and is equal to the number of sound events. Symbol \( h_k \) is the abbreviation of \( h_k(t, f) \) which is the T-F segmentation mask of the \( k \)-th event. Ideally, each T-F segmentation mask \( h_k \) is an ideal ratio mask \(^{(15)}\) of the \( k \)-th sound event.

The second part of the training stage is a classification mapping \( g_2 : h_k \mapsto p_k, k = 1, ..., K \) where \( g_2 \) maps each T-F segmentation mask to the presence probability of the \( k \)-th event, denoted as \( p_k \). Then the binary crossentropy between the predictions \( p_k, k = 1, ..., K \) and the targets \( y_k, k = 1, ..., K \) is calculated as the loss function:

\[
l(p_k, y_k) = -\sum_{k=1}^{K} y_k \log p_k
\]

\[
= -\sum_{k=1}^{K} y_k \log g_2(g_1(X)) \tag{1}
\]

where \( y_k \in \{0, 1\}, k = 1, ..., K \) is the binary representation of the weak labels. Both \( g_1 \) and \( g_2 \) can be modeled by neural networks. The parameters of \( g_1 \) and \( g_2 \) can be trained end-to-end from the input T-F representation of the weakly labelled data.

B. Sound event segmentation in T-F domain

In the inference stage, an input T-F representation of an audio clip is presented to the segmentation mapping \( g_1 \) to obtain the T-F segmentation masks \( h_k, k = 1, ..., K \). The T-F segmentation masks indicate which T-F unit each sound event occupies in the T-F representation (Fig. 3). The learned segmentation masks are affected by the chosen classification mapping \( g_2 \) and will be discussed in Section IV.

C. Sound event detection

As T-F segmentation masks \( h_k, k = 1, ..., K \) contain the information where audio events happen in the T-F domain, the simplest way to obtain the sound event detection score \( v_k(t) \) in time domain is to average out the frequency axis of the T-F segmentation masks (Fig. 4):

\[
v_k(t) = \frac{1}{F} \sum_{f=1}^{F} h_k(t, f), \tag{2}
\]

where \( F \) is the number of frequency bins of the segmentation mask \( h_k \). Then a thresholding and smoothing post processing step can be applied on \( v_k(t) \) to obtain the sound event detection result.

D. Sound event separation

As a byproduct, the T-F segmentation masks can be used to separate sound events in the T-F domain. In addition,
Fig. 5. Sound event separation stage. An input T-F representation is presented to the segmentation mapping \( g_1 \) to obtain the T-F segmentation masks. The upsampled segmentation masks are multiplied with the magnitude spectrum of the input audio to obtain the segmented spectrogram of each audio event. Separated sound events are obtained by applying inverse Fourier transform to the segmented spectrogram.

by applying inverse Fourier transform on the separated T-F representation of each audio event, separated waveforms of sound events can be obtained (Fig. 5). In the sound event separation stage, an audio clip \( x \) is presented to the segmentation mapping \( g_1 \) to obtain T-F segmentation masks. Meanwhile, the complex spectrum \( X^{(sp)} \) of the audio clip is calculated. We use the superscript \( sp \) here to distinguish the complex spectrum from the input T-F representation \( X \), which might not be a spectrum, such as log Mel spectrogram. We interpolate the segmentation masks of the input T-F representation \( h_k \), \( k = 1, ..., K \) to the T-F segmentation masks of complex spectrum \( h_k^{(sp)} \), \( k = 1, ..., K \). The reason for performing interpolation is that \( h_k^{(sp)} \) may have different size of \( h_k \), for example, a log Mel spectrogram has fewer frequency bins than linear spectrum in frequency domain. Then we multiply the upsampled T-F segmentation masks \( h_k^{(sp)} \) with the magnitude of the spectrum to obtain the segmented spectrogram of the \( k \)-th event:

\[
\hat{X}_k = h_k^{(sp)} \odot \left| X^{(sp)} \right|, \quad k = 1, ..., K,
\]

where \( \odot \) represents the element-wise multiplication symbol and \( \hat{X}_k \) represents the segmented spectrogram of the \( k \)-th event. Finally an inverse Fourier transform with overlap add [35] is applied on each segmented spectrogram with the phase from \( X^{(sp)} \) to obtain the separated waveforms \( \hat{s}_k, k = 1, ..., K \):

\[
\hat{s}_k = \text{IFFT} \left( \hat{X}_k \cdot e^{jX^{(sp)}} \right).
\]

We summarize the framework of sound event segmentation, detection and separation in Fig. 6. The training stage, sound event detection stage and sound event separation stage are shown in the left, middle and right column of Fig. 6 respectively.

IV. PROPOSED SEGMENTATION MAPPING AND CLASSIFICATION MAPPING

In this section, we describe the implementation details of the segmentation mapping \( g_1 \) and the classification mapping \( g_2 \) proposed in Section III.

A. Segmentation mapping

Segmentation mapping \( g_1 \) takes a T-F representation of an audio clip as input and outputs segmentation masks of each audio event. We use log Mel spectrogram as the input T-F representation, which has been shown to perform well in audio classification [27, 34, 36]. The segmentation mapping \( g_1 \) is modeled by a CNN described in Section III. Each convolutional layer consists a linear convolution, a batch
normalization (BN) \cite{BN} and a ReLU \cite{ReLU} nonlinearity as in \cite{BN}. The BN inserted between the convolution and the nonlinearity can stabilize as well as speed up the training \cite{BN}. After each convolutional layer, dropout is used as in \cite{Dropout} to regularize overfitting. We do not apply downsampling layers after convolutional layers because we want to retain the resolution of the input T-F segmentation masks.

The idea of learning the T-F segmentation masks explicitly is inspired by work on weakly labelled image localization \cite{WeaklyLabelledImageLocalization} and image segmentation \cite{WeaklyLabelledImageSegmentation, WeaklyLabelledImageSegmentation}. In weakly labelled image localization, saliency maps are learned indicating the locations of the objects in an image \cite{WeaklyLabelledImageLocalization}. Similarly, the T-F segmentation masks in our work resemble the saliency maps of an image \cite{WeaklyLabelledImageLocalization}, where T-F segmentation masks indicate what time and frequency a sound event occur in a T-F representation. Ideally, a T-F segmentation mask can be seen as an ideal ratio mask (IRM) \cite{IdealRatioMask} of its corresponding sound event in the T-F domain (Fig. 7(f)).

### B. Classification mapping

As described in Section III, the classification mapping maps each segmentation mask $h_k$ to the presence probability of its corresponding sound event. Modeling the classification mapping in different ways will lead to different representation of the segmentation masks (Fig. 7). We explored global max pooling \cite{GlobalMaxPooling}, global average pooling \cite{GlobalAveragePooling} and global rank pooling \cite{GlobalRankPooling} for modeling the classification mappings $g_2$.

1) Global max pooling: Global max pooling (GMP) applied on feature maps has been used in audio tagging \cite{GlobalMaxPooling}. GMP on each T-F segmentation mask map $h_k$ is depicted as:

$$F(h_k) = \max_{t,f} h_k(t,f).$$

GMP is based on the assumption that an audio clip contains a sound event if at least one T-F unit of the T-F input representation contains a sound event. GMP is invariant to the location of sound event in the T-F domain, that is, whenever the sound event occurs, GMP will only select the maximum value of a T-F segmentation mask which is robust to the time or frequency shifts of the sound events. However, in the training stage, back propagation will only pass through the maximum value, so only a small part of data in the T-F domain are used to update the parameters in the neural network. Because of the maximum selection strategy, GMP encourages only one point in a T-F segmentation mask to be positive, so GMP underestimates \cite{GlobalMaxPooling} the sound events in the T-F representation. Examples of T-F segmentation masks learned using GMP are shown in Fig. 7(c).

2) Global average pooling: Global average pooling (GAP) was first applied in image classification \cite{GlobalAveragePooling}. GAP on each T-F segmentation mask $h_k$ is depicted as:

$$F(h_k) = \frac{1}{TF} \sum_{t} \sum_{f} h_k(t,f).$$

GAP corresponds to the collective assumption in MIL \cite{MIL}, which states that all T-F units in a T-F segmentation mask contribute equally to the label of the audio clip. That is, all the T-F units in a T-F segmentation mask are assumed to contain the labelled sound events. However, some sound events only last a short time, so GAP usually overestimates the sound events \cite{GlobalAveragePooling}. Examples of T-F segmentation masks learned using GAP are shown in Fig. 7(d).

3) Global weighted rank pooling: To overcome the limitations of GMP and GAP which underestimate and overestimate the sound events in the T-F segmentation masks,
global weighted rank pooling (GWRP) is proposed in [22]. GWRP can be seen as a generalization of GMP and GAP. The idea of GWRP is to put a descending weight on the order of the values within a T-F segmentation mask. Let an index set $I^c = \{i_1, ..., i_n\}$ define the descending order of the values within a T-F segmentation mask $h_k$, i.e. $(h_k)_{i_1} \geq (h_k)_{i_2} \geq ... \geq (h_k)_{i_n}$. Then the GWRP is defined as:

$$F(h_k) = \frac{1}{Z(d_c)} \sum_{j=1}^{T \times F} (d_c)^{j-1}(h_k)_{i_j},$$

(7)

where $0 \leq d_c \leq 1$ is a hyper parameter and $Z(d_c) = \sum_{j=1}^{T \times F} (d_c)^{j-1}$ is a normalization term. When $d_c = 0$ GWRP becomes GMP and when $d_c = 1$ GWRP becomes GAP. The hyperparameter $d_c$ can vary depending on the frequency of occurrence of the sound events. GWAP attends more to the T-F units of high values in a T-F segmentation mask and less to those of low values in a T-F segmentation mask. The T-F segmentation masks learned using GWMP is shown in Fig. 7(e). The ideal binary masks (IBMs) of the sound events are plotted in Fig. 7(f) for comparison with the GMP, GAP and GWRP.

V. EXPERIMENTS

A. Dataset

We use DCASE 2013 sound event detection dataset [11] to evaluate our proposed method, for the reason that DCASE 2013 contains 16 kinds of sound events, larger than DCASE 2017 [46] with 3 kinds of sound events in the sound event detection task. The 16 kinds of sound events in DCASE 2013 include “alert”, “clearthroat”, “cough”, “doorslam”, “drawer”, “keyboard”, “keys”, “knock”, “laughter”, “mouse”, “pageturn”, “pendrop”, “phone”, “printer”, “speech”, “switch”. We remixed these sound events to weakly labelled 10-second audio clips, where each audio clip contains one or several sound events mixed with white noise as background. The mixed sound events are non-overlapping in time. The number of audio events occurring in each audio clip varies from 1 to 4. Fig. 7(a) shows a log Mel spectrogram of a mixed 10-second audio clip. The mixed audio clips are divided to 4 folds. The results are evaluated using cross validation. Source code of our work is available.

B. Evaluation metrics

In audio tagging, we use the precision, recall, F-score [47] and area under curve (AUC) [48] for evaluation. In sound event detection, we evaluate the F-score, AUC and error rate (ER) [47]. In sound event segmentation, we use F-score, AUC and HIT-FA [49] to evaluate the T-F domain segmentation quality.

1) Basic statistics: True positive (TP): Both the reference and the system prediction indicate an event to be active. False negative (FN): The reference indicates an event to be active but the system prediction indicates an event to be inactive. False positive (FP): The system prediction indicates an event to be active but the reference indicates inactive.

2) Precision, recall and F-score: Precision (P) and recall (R) are defined as [47]:

$$P = \frac{TP}{TP + FP}, \quad R = \frac{TP}{TP + FN}.$$  

(8)

Bigger P and R indicates better performance. In addition, false alarm (FA) rate equals $1 - P$. F-score is calculated based on P and R [47]:

$$F = \frac{2PR}{P + R} = \frac{TP}{TP + (FN + FP)/2}.$$  

(9)

Bigger F-score indicates better performance.

3) Area under curve (AUC): A receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve [48] plots true positive rate (TPR) versus false positive rate (FPR). Area under curve (AUC) score is the area under this ROC curve which summarizes the ROC curve to a single number. Bigger AUC indicates better performance.

4) Error rate: Error rate (ER) measures the amount of errors in terms of insertions (I), deletions (D) and substitutions (S) [47]. For the k-th event, the insertions, deletions and substitutions are defined as:

$$S(k) = \min(FN(k), FP(k)),$$

$$D(k) = \max(0, FN(k) - FP(k)),$$

$$I(k) = \max(0, FP(k), FN(k)).$$  

(10)

Lower ER, S, D and I indicate better performance.

5) HIT-FA rate: In [49], hit rate (HIT), an alias of recall and false alarm rate (FA) are used to evaluate segmentation and source separation in the T-F domain. The difference between HIT and FA, HIT-FA rate, has been shown to be well correlated with intelligibility in speech source separation. A larger HIT, HIT-FA and a lower FA indicate better performance.

TABLE I
F-Score of Audio Tagging.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>alert</th>
<th>clear</th>
<th>cough</th>
<th>door</th>
<th>drawer</th>
<th>keybo</th>
<th>keys</th>
<th>knock</th>
<th>laugh</th>
<th>mouse</th>
<th>page</th>
<th>pendr</th>
<th>phone</th>
<th>print</th>
<th>speech</th>
<th>switch</th>
<th>avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BP-MIL</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>0.552</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMP</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.552</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>0.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWRP</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>0.774</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II
Averaged Results of Audio Tagging.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Precision</th>
<th>Recall</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>AUC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BP-MIL</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0.442</td>
<td>0.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMP</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>0.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>0.498</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>0.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWRP</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>0.948</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) To be published after acceptance.
C. Feature

All audio recordings are in single channel, and sampled at 16 kHz. A fast Fourier transform with a Hamming window of 64 ms is used, which has a sufficient time and frequency resolution. An overlap of 32 ms between neighbouring windows is used to smooth the spectrogram. Then a 64 Mel filter bank is applied to the spectrogram followed by log operation to compress the dynamic range to obtain the log Mel spectrogram [34].

D. Model

We apply a “VGG-like” convolutional neural network [50] with 6 convolutional blocks on the input log Mel spectrogram [50]. Each convolutional block consists of a linear convolutional layer with filter size of $3 \times 5$ along time and frequency axis, a batch normalization layer [37] and a ReLU activation [38]. Each convolutional layer contains 64 feature maps. The number of feature maps in the last convolutional layer equals the number of sound events. The last convolutional layer is followed by a sigmoid non-linearity to obtain the T-F segmentation masks. We tested the GMP, GAP and GWRP pooling methods described in Section IV as possible classification mappings. Binary crossentropy over all samples in a mini-batch is used as a loss function:

$$d(\mathbf{p}_n, \mathbf{y}_n) = -\frac{1}{NK} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{K} y_{nk} \ln p_{nk},$$

(11)

where $N$ is the number of samples in a mini-batch. Output of the model and the ground truth are denoted as $\mathbf{p}_n = [p_{n1}, ..., p_{NK}]$ and $\mathbf{y}_n = [y_{n1}, ..., y_{NK}]$, respectively. The Adam optimizer [51] with a learning rate 0.001 is used for its fast convergence in training neural networks.

E. Audio tagging

Table III shows the F-score of audio tagging with classification mapping $g_2$ modeled by GMP, GAP and GWRP. The result is compared with the back propagation multiple instance learning (BP-MIL) proposed in [9]. Table III shows that GMP, GAP and GWRP all outperform the BP-MIL baseline in audio tagging. GWRP achieves an averaged F-score of 0.774.

In addition, good recognition results have been achieved for sound events such as “phone” and “speech”. However, short sound events such as “switch” are comparatively difficult to recognize. Table IV shows the precision, recall, F-score and AUC statistics averaged over sound events, respectively. Table IV shows that GWRP performs better than GMP, GAP and the BP-MIL baseline. Fig. 7 also shows using GWRP for classification mapping leads to better T-F segmentation masks which are close to the IBM shown in Fig. 7(f).

F. Sound event detection

We evaluate SED using both frame-wise and event-wise statistics [47]. Table V shows the F-score of frame-wise sound event detection with the BP-MIL baseline and classification mapping $g_2$ modeled by GMP, GAP and GWRP. Averaged F-score of 0.533 is obtained using GWRP, which outperforms the baseline BP-MIL and the classification mapping $g_2$ modeled by GMP and GAP. For notable sound events such as “phone” and “speech”, higher detection F-scores have been obtained.

In contrast, lower F-scores are obtained for instantaneous sound events such as “door” and “switch”. Table V shows the averaged F-score, AUC, ER, substitution rate ($S$), deletion rate ($D$) and insertion rate ($I$) over sound events. Table V shows that GMP leads to a large deletion error, which indicates...
TABLE VII
HIT-FA SCORE OF T-F SEGMENTATION.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>alert</th>
<th>clear</th>
<th>cough</th>
<th>door</th>
<th>drawer</th>
<th>keybo</th>
<th>keys</th>
<th>knock</th>
<th>laugh</th>
<th>mouse</th>
<th>page</th>
<th>pendr</th>
<th>phone</th>
<th>print</th>
<th>speech</th>
<th>switch</th>
<th>avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GMP</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>-0.157</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWRP</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.487</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 8. Sound event detection results of GMP, GAP, GWRP and IBM.

TABLE VIII
AVERAGED RESULTS OF SOUND EVENT SEGMENTATION IN T-F DOMAIN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F-score</th>
<th>AUC</th>
<th>HIT</th>
<th>FA</th>
<th>HIT - FA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GMP</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>0.520</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>0.549</td>
<td>0.349</td>
<td>0.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWRP</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>0.322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

that GMP tends to underestimate sound events in the T-F segmentation masks. In contrast, GAP leads to large insertion error, indicating that GAP tends to overestimate sound events in the T-F segmentation masks. Table VII and Table VIII show the event-wise scores and their averaged statistics. GWRP performs better than GAP, BP-MIL and GMP.

G. Sound event segmentation

We calculate F-score, AUC, HIT-FA for evaluating sound event segmentation in the T-F domain. HIT-FA is used for time-frequency domain segmentation [49]. Table VII shows the HIT-FA score in the T-F domain. GWRP achieves an average HIT-FA of 0.322, outperforming GAP and GMP. Table VIII shows the averaged statistics of T-F segmentation. GWRP outperforms both GMP and GAP across all three metrics: F-score, AUC and HIT-FA.

H. Visualization of the learned representation

Fig. 7(a-b) show the log Mel spectrogram and the spectrogram (in log scale) of a mixed audio clip containing three events. Fig. 7(c-f) shows the learned T-F segmentation masks using GMP, GAP, GWRP and the ground truth ideal binary mask (IBM). Fig. 7 shows that GMP tends to underestimate the IBM while GAP tends to overestimate the IBM. In contrast, GWRP learns better T-F segmentation masks, which are closer to IBM. Fig. 8 shows the SED scores calculated from the segmentation masks using Equation 2. Sounds detected using GWRP are a closer match to the ground truth than those using GMP and GAP. In addition, waveforms of sound events can be obtained from the T-F segmentation masks by applying Equation 4. Fig. 9 shows the waveform of a mixed audio, the clean targets and waveform separated from T-F segmentation masks.

VI. Conclusion

This paper proposes a framework for time-frequency (T-F) segmentation and sound event segmentation using weakly labelled data. In training, a segmentation mapping and a classification mapping is trained jointly using the weakly labelled data. In T-F segmentation, T-F segmentation masks can be obtained by presenting an input T-F representation of an audio clip to the trained segmentation mapping. Detected sound events can then be obtained from the T-F segmentation masks. As a byproduct, separated waveforms of sound events can be obtained from the T-F segmentation masks. Experiments show that using global weighted rank pooling (GWRP) outperforms the BP-MIL baseline, global max pooling and global average pooling in both of T-F segmentation and sound event detection. In future, we will further research on polyphonic sound event detection and T-F segmentation with weakly labelled data.
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