arXiv:2008.03615v1 [eess.AS] 8 Aug 2020

Exploring the Use of an Unsupervised Autoregressive Model as a Shared Encoder for Text-Dependent Speaker Verification

Vijay Ravi, Ruchao Fan, Amber Afshan, Huanhua Lu, Abeer Alwan

University of California Los Angeles, USA

(vijaysumaravi,fanruchao,amberafshan,huanhua,alwan)@ucla.edu

Abstract

In this paper, we propose a novel way of addressing text-dependent automatic speaker verification (TD-ASV) by using a shared-encoder with task-specific decoders. An autoregressive predictive coding (APC) encoder is pre-trained in an unsupervised manner using both out-of-domain (LibriSpeech, VoxCeleb) and in-domain (DeepMine) unlabeled datasets to learn generic, high-level feature representation that encapsulates speaker and phonetic content. Two task-specific decoders were trained using labeled datasets to classify speakers (SID) and phrases (PID). Speaker embeddings extracted from the SID decoder were scored using a PLDA. SID and PID systems were fused at the score level. There is a 51.9% relative improvement in minDCF for our system compared to the fully supervised x-vector baseline on the cross-lingual DeepMine dataset. However, the i-vector/HMM method outperformed the proposed APC encoder-decoder system. A fusion of the x-vector/PLDA baseline and the SID/PLDA scores prior to PID fusion further improved performance by 15% indicating complementarity of the proposed approach to the x-vector system. We show that the proposed approach can leverage from large, unlabeled, data-rich domains, and learn speech patterns independent of downstream tasks. Such a system can provide competitive performance in domain-mismatched scenarios where test data is from data-scarce domains.

Index Terms: speaker verification, unsupervised-learning, feature-representation, shared-encoder, domain-adaptation.

1. Introduction

Text-dependent automatic speaker verification (TD-ASV) systems classify pairs of speech utterances as same or different based on the speaker's identity and the lexical content of the phrases spoken. This is analogous to two-factor authentication, in that the phrase identification (PID) and the speaker identification (SID), both, have to match for the user to gain access. The applications of TD-ASV include, but are not limited to, biometric verification in healthcare [1], banking, forensics [2], and privacy protection in personalized voice-assistants [3].

While the same-or-different speaker decision accuracy is of utmost importance, it is also beneficial if the TD-ASV system is resilient to domain mismatch between the training and testing data. This would enable the deployment of TD-ASV systems, originally developed for data-rich domains, to data-scarce domains thereby extending TD-ASV to unconventional domains like children's speech or zero-resource languages. To facilitate research in this direction, the short-duration speaker verification challenge (SDSVC), 2020 [4] provides a standardized evaluation platform for researchers to test and benchmark their ASV systems using a common evaluation dataset. In this study, we address the problem of TD-ASV in a novel way by training an encoder in an unsupervised fashion to learn shared feature representations of both speaker and phrase identity.




Figure 1: *Encoder-Decoder model architecture proposed in this paper. The encoder is an APC model trained in an unsupervised way to learn a generic, high-level feature representation independent of downstream tasks. The decoders (PID and SID) are trained in a supervised manner.*

Previously, the i-vector/PLDA (probabilistic linear discriminant analysis) method [5, 6] and some of its extensions [7, 8] showed promising results on the TD-ASV task. Zenali *et al*. introduced the HMM based i-vector approach [9, 10], and used a set of phone-specific HMMs to collect the statistics for i-vector extraction. In [11], Variani *et al*. replaced the conventional i-vectors by using deep neural networks (DNNs) to learn speaker discriminative features (d-vector). A phonetically-aware TD-ASV system was developed to extract i-vectors using: a) output posteriors [12] and b) bottleneck features [13], as frame alignments, which were generated from a DNN trained for automatic speech recognition (ASR).To tackle the shorter utterance problem, convolutional neural networks [14] and DNNs [15] were used to map the i-vectors extracted from short utterances to the corresponding long-utterance i-vectors. Although these systems

This study was supported in part by the NSF.

were effective, they relied on handcrafted dictionaries to generate alignments for every phrase and large, labeled, in-domain datasets. On the contrary, the proposed method needs no dictionaries or alignments and can take advantage of abundantly available out-of-domain data. More recently, the end-to-end (E2E) approach of training TD-ASV systems has gained significant momentum. Heigold *et al*. proposed an E2E system combining the training, the evaluation and the verification process into a single compact network and jointly optimized all parameters using a verification-based loss [16]. In [17], Zhang *et al*. suggested an attention based E2E network for jointly learning speaker and phonetic discriminative features. In contrast to the previous E2E systems that were trained on a tuple-based loss function, Wan *et al*. proposed the generalized E2E loss function [18]. These E2E systems were, however, computationally expensive and optimized to perform well only for a specific phrase (eg: the wake-word phrase).

Inspired by the recent success of unsupervised pre-training [19, 20] and representation learning [21, 22, 23], we propose to use a shared-encoder with two task-specific decoders for TD-ASV. The model architecture is as shown in Figure 1. Specifically, an autoregressive predictive coding (APC) encoder [21] is trained in an unsupervised way to learn a generic feature representation. The encoded representation encapsulates both speaker and phonetic discriminative features. We then use features extracted from the encoder as input to task-specific decoders to predict phrase identity and extract speaker embeddings. Since the APC encoder is trained using unlabeled data (in-domain and out-of-domain), it is capable of capturing high-level speech representation independent of data domain or downstream tasks. The proposed shared-encoder architecture obviates the need for two separate encoders for each individual task and large amounts of labeled in-domain data for training. Results on the domain-mismatched evaluation data demonstrate that the proposed shared-encoder model can also be effective in domain adaptation in TD-ASV.

Prior work in feature-learning includes [24, 21, 25]. Liu *et al*. suggested the use of DNNs for feature extraction [24]. Their method, however, required labeled data for training the feature-extractor in contrast to the unsupervised method employed in this study. Chung *et al*. proposed the unsupervised APC encoder in [21] but used the extracted feature representations with an i-vector/PLDA SID system as opposed to the task-specific decoders suggested in this paper. While these methods reported results on domain-matched datasets, the proposed model was evaluated on DeepMine data which consists of Persian and English phrases spoken by non-native English speakers. All evaluations are in accordance with Task-1 of the short duration speaker verification challenge (SDSVC) [4].

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: in Section 2, the encoder-decoder structure is presented. The datasets used and the model architecture proposed are outlined in Section 3, results are presented and discussed in Section 4 and conclusion and the future directions are provided in Section 5.

2. Encoder-Decoder TD-ASV

2.1. Autoregressive Predicitive Coding (APC) Encoder

Predictive coding has played an important role in speech processing, especially in speech coding using linear prediction coding (LPC) [26]. LPC predicts future audio samples whereas, a recently proposed autoregressive predictive coding [21] predicts the features of a future frame. The idea is to utilize the input sequence itself as labels and predict a frame n steps ahead of the current frame to achieve unsupervised speech representation learning. The model architecture is as shown in Figure 1.

Suppose the input speech sequence is $\mathbf{X} = (x_1, x_2, ..., x_T)$, the time shift of prediction is fixed at n, and the ground truth of the prediction for each frame is $(x_{1+n}, x_{2+n}, ..., x_{T+n})$. In order to prevent the model from learning a trivial solution, we apply a uni-directional neural network structure, as opposed to bi-directional networks, by letting the model be aware of the context only from history. By stacking multiple long short-term memory (LSTM) layers and adding residual connections, we obtain a deep LSTM network. Prior to that, a two-layer feed-forward network is considered as the pre-net network to transform the speech features into a hidden latent space. Together with LSTMs, we denote this combined network as DLSTM. The output of the DLSTM is then fed into a linear layer and transferred to the input space, which means that the dimension will be the same as the input features. Mathematically, the model architecture can be described as follows:

$$\mathbf{Y} = W_f DLSTM(\mathbf{X}, W_{lstm}) + b_f \tag{1}$$

where W_{lstm} represents all the parameters in the DLSTM; W_f and b_f denote the weight matrix and bias vector in the last layer, respectively; and $\mathbf{Y} = (y_1, y_2, ..., y_T)$ is the output. Considering the L1 loss as a metric distance for prediction, all the above parameters are obtained by optimizing the following loss function:

$$L_1 = \sum_{t=1}^{T-n} |x_{t+n} - y_t| \tag{2}$$

2.2. Task-specific Decoder

The PID decoder was designed to distinguish between different phrases. In order to obtain better generalization and faster convergence, we allowed the PID decoder to learn frame-level phonetic representations through a phoneme classification task using the connectionist temporal classification (CTC) [27]. The frame-level representations were then averaged using a statistical pooling layer to form a single feature vector for sentence-level phrase classification. Specifically, the speech representation obtained in Section 2.1 was first fed into a stacked bi-directional LSTM network (BLSTM) to get the frame-level representations. Then, the frame-level representations were used as the inputs for two subsequent networks. In the first network, they were transformed into the phoneme space to capture phonetic information. In the second network, a pooling layer and two feed-forward layers were used to transcribe the frame-level representations to phrase-ID space followed by a softmax layer. The overall PID decoder was optimized by jointly minimizing the following loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{total} = \mathcal{L}_{CTC} + \lambda \mathcal{L}_{CE}, \tag{3}$$

where, $\mathcal{L}_{CTC}$ is the CTC loss for phoneme classification and $\mathcal{L}_{CE}$ is the loss arising from the phrase classification. We use λ as a regularizing hyperparameter to control the contribution of the CE loss to the total loss.

The speaker-ID decoder consists of another BLSTM network followed by a statistical pooling layer to extract speaker embeddings. Speech representations obtained from the APC encoder in Section 2.1 are used here as input. The size of the final transformation layer is dependent on the number of speakers in the dataset. The SID decoder is optimized by minimizing the cross entropy loss arising from the classification of speakers.

3. Experimental Details

3.1. Datasets

The specifications of the datasets used in this paper are provided in Table 1. Utterances from LibriSpeech, VoxCeleb1 and VoxCeleb2 [28] and DeepMine Part-1 [29, 30] were used for three different tasks: 1) Unsupervised pre-training of the shared encoder, 2) Phrase ID training, and 3) Speaker ID training. In this section, we provide details of the subsets of data used for each task.

Table 1: *Details of the datasets used.*

Subset	Database	# Utts	# Spks	Duration (in hours)
train-librispeech	Librispeech	140k	5466	478.5
dev-librispeech	Librispeech	2.7k	97	5.3
train-voxceleb	VoxCeleb	1.2M	7350	2637.8
dev-voxceleb	VoxCeleb	73k	7350	151.2
train-deepmine	DeepMine	101k	963	91.5
dev-deepmine	DeepMine	37k	NA	31.6
test-deepmine	DeepMine	69k	NA	61.2

The in-domain training data (*train-deepmine*) contains speech utterances from 963 speakers, some of whom have only Persian phrases. The enrollment (*dev-deepmine*) and test utterances (*test-deepmine*) are drawn from a fixed set of ten phrases consisting of five Persian and five English phrases, respectively. More details of the phrases can be found in [29].

3.1.1. Unsupervised Pre-training of Shared Encoder

The unsupervised pre-training of the shared encoder used the out-of-domain *train-librispeech* subset, 500k utterance from VoxCeleb and the in-domain *train-depmine* subset. Since the APC encoder can be trained with unvoiced frames as well, no speech activity detection (SAD) is applied. A uniform sampling rate of 16 KHz is used across datasets. To prevent overfitting, a combined development set consisting of *dev-librispeech*, *dev-voxceleb* and *dev-deepmine* were used for hyperparameter selection.

3.1.2. Task Specific Decoder Training

For training the phrase ID decoder, 100 hours of LibriSpeech and all utterances of *train-deepmine* were used. *dev-librispeech* and the *dev-deepmine* dataset were used for hyperparameter selection.

The SID decoder was trained using 1.2M utterances (7350 speakers) from the VoxCeleb dataset. Similar to the data processing of the x-vector system in [31], the utterances were cut into 3 second segments and augmented with noise from the MUSAN database [32] resulting in a total of 3.2M utterances ($\sim$ 7k hours).

3.2. Front-End Processing

The Kaldi framework [33] was used for all front-end preprocessing and feature extraction for each of the three tasks. The features are 40 dimensional filterbanks with a frame-length of 25ms and a frame shift of 10ms. Cepstral mean and variance normalization is applied on the features. The energy SAD (from Kaldi), used in the speaker embedding extraction, filters out non-speech frames.

3.3. Model Architecture

3.3.1. APC Encoder

The APC encoder DLSTM is composed of 4 layers of unidirectional LSTMs with each layer consisting of 512 hidden units. The input to the shared-encoder is 40 dimensional filter-bank features. The shared encoder is trained in an auto-regressive manner by minimizing the L1 loss function as described in Section 2.

The pre-net feature embedding network of the encoder DLSTM is made up of 2 fully-connected layers with ReLU activations. The encoder model is initialized using the Xavier uniform initialization and a dropout of 0.1 is applied to the ReLu activation function.

During evaluation, the shared-encoder is used as a feature extractor to extract learned representations for each utterance. These feature representations are the hidden RNN states of the APC model and form a 4-dimensional tensor of the shape (number-layers, batch-size, sequence-length, RNN-hidden-size). In our experiments, 512 dimensional hidden states of all 4 RNN layers of the APC model were used. Features extracted from the APC model are then fed into the task-specific decoder for learning the corresponding speaker and phrase identities.

3.3.2. Task Specific Decoders

Two standalone decoders are trained to classify speech utterances based on speakers and phrase-IDs. Each decoder is trained and evaluated separately.

The phrase ID (PID) decoder is composed of 3 layers of bidirectional LSTMs made up of 512 hidden units. The output of these BLSTM layers is then fed into two different sub-networks to predict phonemes and classify phrases. The mapping from Persian to English phoneme set is adopted as suggested in the data corpus, leading to 39 phonemes in total. Therefore, the phoneme prediction sub-network is a linear layer with a 40 dimensional (39 phonemes + 1 blank) output. The phrase classification sub-network consists of a pooling layer followed by a fully-connected layer (400 hidden units) and a prediction layer of 11 outputs (10 phrases + 1 no match). Since we utilize out of domain data which do not have phrase-ID labels, we add an extra category for all utterances whose contents do not match the given 10 phrases of the evaluation data. We observe that the PID decoder converges well when λ (defined in section 2.2) is heuristically set to 0.2.

The speaker ID decoder is made up of 3 layers of bidirectional LSTMs each consisting of 512 hidden units. This is followed by statistical pooling, a fully-connected (dense) layer, and a prediction layer. The dimension of the prediction layer 7350 based on the number of speakers in the training set. During evaluation, the bottleneck features (outputs from the dense layer of the SID decoder) are extracted and used as speaker embeddings. The dimension of the fully-connected dense layer is set at 600 similar to the x-vector system.

3.4. Model Training and Evaluation

The shared encoder was trained for 5 epochs with a learning rate of $2e^{-4}$. The weights and biases of the shared-encoder network were frozen after the training to ensure that the task-specific optimization of the decoders did not modify the shared-encoder

the. Both the phrase ID and the speaker ID decoder networks were trained in parallel to minimize their corresponding loss functions. Decoders were trained for 5 epochs with a learning rate of $2e^{-4}$ and the learning rate was annealed by a factor of 0.5 after 3 epochs.

During evaluation,the log likelihood of phrase-ID of test utterance and the corresponding enrollment utterance being the same is computed as the PID score. Speaker embeddings are extracted from the dense layer of the SID decoder. A PLDA classifier is used to compare the extracted speaker embeddings, and predict target/imposter speaker decisions. Speaker embeddings extracted from the speaker ID decoder were centered and projected using LDA. The LDA dimension was tuned on the VoxCeleb training set to 200. After dimensionality reduction, the representations were length-normalized and modeled by the PLDA and the PLDA model was then adapted using the DeepMine training data. The log-likelihood scores of the PLDA model (SID scores) and the PID model were fused to generate the final system prediction.

4. Results and Discussion

Table 2 provides results obtained from the text-dependent speaker verification task of SDSVC on the evaluation data. System performance is compared using the normalized minimum detection cost function (minDCF) [34].

Two baselines were provided in the challenge evaluation plan for this task: the x-vector system and i-vector/HMM system. The state-of-the-art x-vector method, based on the TDNN architecture of [31], was trained using VoxCeleb1 and VoxCeleb2 databases. Evaluation trials, as per the provided baseline, were scored using the PLDA without any score normalization. The i-vector/HMM method, that also takes into consideration phrase information, was selected as the second baseline. Among the published results, the i-vector/HMM method is the best performing system on DeepMine data.

Table 2: *Results for the text-dependent task of the SDSV challenge in terms of minDCF and EER.* * *indicates baseline and* $+$ *indicates score-level fusion using linear regression.*

Speaker ID System	**Phrase ID System**	**minDCF**	**EER (%)**
x-vector*	None	0.5611	10.13
i-vector*	HMM	0.1472	3.47
x-vector	PID	0.2170	4.80
SID	PID	0.2697	6.28
SID + x-vector	PID	0.1830	4.18

The proposed system achieves a minDCF of 0.2697 and an EER of 6.28%. This represents a relative improvement of 51.9% in terms of minDCF (0.5611 for the x-vector baseline versus 0.2697 for the proposed method) and 38% in terms of EER (10.13% to 6.28%). In order to have a fair comparison between the x-vector system and the shared-encoder system, we fused the scores of x-vectors and PID. We observed that, in this case, the performance of the fused x-vectors was better than the shared encoder system. The minDCF improved relatively by 19.5% (from 0.2697 to 0.2170) and the EER by 23.5% (from 6.28% to 4.8%). Thus, the x-vector system, on its own, is better at capturing speaker discriminatory features, than the SID network of the proposed framework. Nevertheless, on the overall task of TD-ASV, the proposed system performs better than the x-vector baseline. This improvement in performance can be attributed to the unsupervised pre-training of the shared-encoder using unlabeled in-domain data and the use of phonetic information by the proposed system. As a result, our system is better suited for the text-dependent, cross-lingual task of this challenge in comparison to the x-vector baseline.

To further analyze the performance of the proposed system, fusion of the x-vector/PLDA scores and the SID/PLDA scores was performed using linear regression before fusing with PID scores. Equal coefficients of 0.5 were chosen for this linear regression which resulted in a 15% gain in minDCF (0.2170 to 0.1830) and a 12% relative gain in EER (4.8% to 4.18%). These results seem to suggest that the SID system offers complimentary information to the x-vector system. It is possible that the proposed unsupervised method learns useful speaker-discriminative information that was previously discarded when learning representations in a supervised fashion. Combining supervised and unsupervised feature representations can therefore be advantageous in developing robust TD-ASV systems.

The performance of the i-vector/HMM method, on the other hand, exceeded that of the proposed method by 45% (minDCF of 0.1472 vs 0.2697). This system used hidden Markov model (HMM) states to model time sequences and extract i-vectors for each phrase. The i-vector/HMM approach outperforms the proposed method mainly because of its capability to reject target-wrong trials, meaning that if two different phrases were spoken by the same speaker, the HMM Viterbi decoding produced invalid statistics for such trials and consequently they were rejected easily [10]. In contrast, since the PID and the SID systems were fused by a simple score-level fusion, our system may have predicted higher log-likelihoods. A comprehensive analysis of the results could not be performed because the ground truth labels for the evaluation data were not available.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, a novel model architecture comprised of a shared-encoder with task-specific decoders was proposed for TD-ASV. An auto-regressive predictive coding encoder was trained in an unsupervised fashion to learn generic features independent of the downstream task. Task-specific decoders were then optimized for phrase and speaker classification. An improvement of 52% was achieved in terms of minDCF compared to the x-vector baseline. The i-vector/HMM method was the best performing system.

The proposed method has the advantage of learning high-level speech patterns from large, unlabeled, data-rich domains. The encoded speech representations successfully captured speaker and phonetic discriminative features. Results obtained on the evaluation dataset demonstrated the domain-adaptaion ability of the proposed system. Further, strong evidence of the complementarity of the proposed system was found when the x-vector scores were fused with the scores of the encoder-SID decoder.

A natural progression of this work is to compare the effectiveness of the APC encoder against other unsupervised methods such as the contrastive prediction approach. Further research could also be conducted to determine the applicability of the shared-encoder on other data-scarce domains, for example, accented speech, zero-resource languages, children's speech. Additionally, both PID and SID systems could be jointly trained as a multi-task problem to make the system more robust.

6. References

[1] F. Sigona, "Voice biometrics technologies and applications for healthcare: an overview." *JDREAM. Journal of interDisciplinary REsearch Applied to Medicine*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 5–16, 2018.

[2] N. Singh, R. Khan, and R. Shree, "Applications of speaker recognition," *Procedia engineering*, vol. 38, pp. 3122–3126, 2012.

[3] Y.-T. Chang and M. J. Dupuis, "My voiceprint is my authenticator: A two-layer authentication approach using voiceprint for voice assistants," in *2019 IEEE SmartWorld, Ubiquitous Intelligence & Computing, Advanced & Trusted Computing, Scalable Computing & Communications, Cloud & Big Data Computing, Internet of People and Smart City Innovation (SmartWorld/SCALCOM/UIC/ATC/CBDCom/IOP/SCI)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1318–1325.

[4] H. Zeinali, K. A. Lee, J. Alam, and L. Burget, "Short-duration speaker verification (sdsv) challenge 2020: the challenge evaluation plan." arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.06311, Tech. Rep., 2020.

[5] N. Dehak, P. J. Kenny, R. Dehak, P. Dumouchel, and P. Ouellet, "Front-end factor analysis for speaker verification," *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 788–798, 2010.

[6] P. Kenny, T. Stafylakis, P. Ouellet, M. J. Alam, and P. Dumouchel, "Plda for speaker verification with utterances of arbitrary duration," in *2013 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 7649–7653.

[7] A. Larcher, K. A. Lee, B. Ma, and H. Li, "Phonetically-constrained plda modeling for text-dependent speaker verification with multiple short utterances," in *2013 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 7673–7677.

[8] T. Stafylakis, P. Kenny, P. Ouellet, J. Perez, M. Kockmann, and P. Dumouchel, "Text-dependent speaker recognition using plda with uncertainty propagation," *matrix*, vol. 500, no. 1, 2013.

[9] H. Zeinali, H. Sameti, L. Burget, J. Cernockỳ, N. Maghsoodi, and P. Matejka, "i-vector/hmm based text-dependent speaker verification system for reddots challenge." in *InterSpeech*, 2016, pp. 440–444.

[10] H. Zeinali, H. Sameti, and L. Burget, "Hmm-based phrase-independent i-vector extractor for text-dependent speaker verification," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 25, no. 7, pp. 1421–1435, 2017.

[11] E. Variani, X. Lei, E. McDermott, I. L. Moreno, and J. Gonzalez-Dominguez, "Deep neural networks for small footprint text-dependent speaker verification," in *2014 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 4052–4056.

[12] Y. Lei, N. Scheffer, L. Ferrer, and M. McLaren, "A novel scheme for speaker recognition using a phonetically-aware deep neural network," in *2014 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 1695–1699.

[13] H. Zeinali, L. Burget, H. Sameti, O. Glembek, and O. Plchot, "Deep neural networks and hidden markov models in i-vector-based text-dependent speaker verification." in *Odyssey*, 2016, pp. 24–30.

[14] J. Guo, U. A. Nookala, and A. Alwan, "Cnn-based joint mapping of short and long utterance i-vectors for speaker verification using short utterances." in *INTERSPEECH*, 2017, pp. 3712–3716.

[15] J. Guo, N. Xu, K. Qian, Y. Shi, K. Xu, Y. Wu, and A. Alwan, "Deep neural network based i-vector mapping for speaker verification using short utterances," *Speech Communication*, vol. 105, pp. 92–102, 2018.

[16] G. Heigold, I. Moreno, S. Bengio, and N. Shazeer, "End-to-end text-dependent speaker verification," in *2016 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 5115–5119.

[17] S.-X. Zhang, Z. Chen, Y. Zhao, J. Li, and Y. Gong, "End-to-end attention based text-dependent speaker verification," in *2016 IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop (SLT)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 171–178.

[18] L. Wan, Q. Wang, A. Papir, and I. L. Moreno, "Generalized end-to-end loss for speaker verification," in *2018 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 4879–4883.

[19] J. Devlin, M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova, "Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.

[20] S. Schneider, A. Baevski, R. Collobert, and M. Auli, "wav2vec: Unsupervised pre-training for speech recognition," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.05862*, 2019.

[21] Y.-A. Chung, W.-N. Hsu, H. Tang, and J. Glass, "An unsupervised autoregressive model for speech representation learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.03240*, 2019.

[22] Y.-A. Chung and J. Glass, "Generative pre-training for speech with autoregressive predictive coding," in *ICASSP*, 2020.

[23] A. v. d. Oord, Y. Li, and O. Vinyals, "Representation learning with contrastive predictive coding," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.03748*, 2018.

[24] Y. Liu, Y. Qian, N. Chen, T. Fu, Y. Zhang, and K. Yu, "Deep feature for text-dependent speaker verification," *Speech Communication*, vol. 73, pp. 1–13, 2015.

[25] A. K. Sarkar, Z.-H. Tan, H. Tang, S. Shon, and J. Glass, "Time-contrastive learning based deep bottleneck features for text-dependent speaker verification," *Ieee/acm Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 27, no. 8, pp. 1267–1279, 2019.

[26] D. O'Shaughnessy, "Linear predictive coding," *IEEE potentials*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 29–32, 1988.

[27] A. Graves, S. Fernández, F. Gomez, and J. Schmidhuber, "Connectionist temporal classification: labelling unsegmented sequence data with recurrent neural networks," in *Proceedings of the 23rd international conference on Machine learning*, 2006, pp. 369–376.

[28] A. Nagrani, J. S. Chung, and A. Zisserman, "Voxceleb: a large-scale speaker identification dataset," in *INTERSPEECH*, 2017.

[29] H. Zeinali, H. Sameti, and T. Stafylakis, "Deepmine speech processing database: Text-dependent and independent speaker verification and speech recognition in persian and english." in *Odyssey*, 2018, pp. 386–392.

[30] H. Zeinali, L. Burget, J. Černockỳ *et al.*, "A multi purpose and large scale speech corpus in persian and english for speaker and speech recognition: the deepmine database," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.03627*, 2019.

[31] D. Snyder, D. Garcia-Romero, G. Sell, D. Povey, and S. Khudanpur, "X-vectors: Robust dnn embeddings for speaker recognition," in *2018 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 5329–5333.

[32] D. Snyder, G. Chen, and D. Povey, "Musan: A music, speech, and noise corpus," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.08484*, 2015.

[33] D. Povey, A. Ghoshal, G. Boulianne, L. Burget, O. Glembek, N. Goel, M. Hannemann, P. Motlicek, Y. Qian, P. Schwarz *et al.*, "The kaldi speech recognition toolkit," in *IEEE 2011 workshop on automatic speech recognition and understanding*, no. CONF. IEEE Signal Processing Society, 2011.

[34] A. F. Martin and C. S. Greenberg, "The nist 2010 speaker recognition evaluation," in *Eleventh Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association*, 2010.