

Noisy Label Detection for Speaker Recognition

Ruibin Yuan¹, Hanzhi Yin¹, Yi Wang², Yifan He², Yushi Ye², Lei Zhang³

^{1,2}Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA 15213, USA

³Stardust.ai, Beijing, China

{ruibiny¹, hanzhiy¹, wangyi², yifanhe², yushiye²}@andrew.cmu.edu
lei.zhang@stardust.ai³

Abstract

The success of deep neural networks requires both high annotation quality and massive data. However, the size and the quality of a dataset are usually a trade-off in practice, as data collection and cleaning are expensive and time-consuming. Therefore, automatic noisy label detection (NLD) techniques are critical to real-world applications, especially those using crowdsourcing datasets. As this is an under-explored topic in automatic speaker verification (ASV), we present a simple but effective solution to the task. First, we compare the effectiveness of various commonly used metric learning loss functions under different noise settings. Then, we propose two ranking-based NLD methods, inter-class inconsistency and intra-class inconsistency ranking. They leverage the inconsistent nature of noisy labels and show high detection precision even under a high level of noise. Our solution gives rise to both efficient and effective cleaning of large-scale speaker recognition datasets.

Index Terms: speaker recognition, noisy label detection, metric learning, contrastive learning, inconsistency, ranking-based.

1. Introduction

The success of Deep Neural Networks (DNNs) heavily relies on large-scale datasets with high-quality annotations. However, in practice, the size and the quality of datasets are usually a trade-off, as collecting reliable datasets is labor-intensive and time-consuming. This implies that datasets usually contain some hard-to-estimate inaccurate annotations, often referred to as "noisy labels". Noisy labels may over-parameterize DNNs and lead to performance degradation due to the memorization effect. These pose bottlenecks in training and employing DNNs in real-world scenarios.

Various strategies have been proposed to mitigate the negative effects of noisy labels, usually referred to as noisy-label learning (NLL) techniques [1]. Loss correction technique is one of the effective ways [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7]. It usually involves modifying the loss function to make it robust to the label noise, or correcting the loss values according to the label noise. Another approach is to let neural nets correct the labels during training. The correction signal can be computed from an external neural structure [8] or algorithm [9], or internal structure, i.e. a noise layer [10]. Co-teaching is another way of label correction. It usually involves training two networks simultaneously through dataset co-divide, label co-refinement, and co-guessing, in order to filter out label noise for each other [11, 12, 13].

The majority of such research studies are from the computer vision domain. For the audio and speech domain, much less research on noisy labels has been conducted. [14] applied semi-supervised techniques to learn from soft pseudo labels, and ensembles the predictions to overcome noisy data. [15] explored the extent of noisy labels' influences on trained x-vector em-

beddings [16]. They showed that mislabeled data can severely damage the performance of speaker verification systems on the NIST SRE 2016 dataset [17], and proposed regularization approaches to mitigate the damage. Later, [18] also demonstrated that label noise leads to significant performance degradation for both the x-vector front-end and PLDA back-end on NIST SRE 2016, and proposed a few strategies to resist label noise. Contrary to previous results, [19] experimented with simulating noise on the VoxCeleb2 dataset [20], and showed that even high levels of label noise had only a slight impact on the ASV task, using either GE2E or CE loss functions. However, the noises that they investigate are all closed-set noise [21], and never consider another type of frequently occurring noise, open-set noise. The most similar work to this work is [22], which proposed an iterative filtering method to remove noisy labels from the training set iteratively in order to improve the speaker recognition performance on the VoxCeleb. However, it requires manually setting a similarity threshold for the filtering and focuses on mitigating the noise effect.

In this paper, instead of directly mitigating the effects of label noise, we try to address this problem from the root cause: we focus on the detection of noisy labels¹. Detecting and filtering noisy labels benefits not only the model training, but also the crowdsourcing data platforms, e.g. Amazon Mechanical Turk and Scale AI. The filtered noisy labels can be used for relabeling to build higher quality datasets, or identifying the noisy labels providers, i.e. cheaters. Specifically, we investigate noisy label detection (NLD) under the context of speaker recognition, as this has been an under-explored topic, yet it plays an important role in collecting and correcting speaker identity annotations in large-scale speech datasets. We are the first to comprehensively compare various common metric learning loss functions used in the ASV task under a variety of noise settings, open-set noise and closed-set noise with different noise levels, on a relatively large scale for the first time. Second, we propose two ranking-based NLD methods based on the inconsistent nature of the noisy labels, and achieve high detection precision even under high level of noise.

2. Method

Our pipeline is shown in Fig. 1. Firstly, we add noise to a clean dataset to simulate real-life noise. Then, we train an X-vector with commonly used metric learning loss functions under different noise settings. With the learned speaker embedder, we propose two inconsistency-ranking-based NLD methods. Finally, we compare and evaluate the proposed methods.

¹The research project code can be found at <https://github.com/a43992899/NoisySpeakerDetection>

Table 1: Baseline EER on VoxCeleb 1 Testing Dataset

	Permute Noise Level	EER(%)			Permute Noise Level	EER(%)	
		bs=128	bs=256			bs=128	bs=256
CE	0%	9.26	9.39	AAM	0%	7.70	8.58
	20%	12.68	14.29		20%	8.44	9.43
	50%	13.57	15.54		50%	28.49	11.15
	75%	18.04	17.80		75%	unconverged	27.11
GE2E	0%(m=4)	8.80	7.68	AAMSC	0%	6.91(k=3)	7.21(k=10)
	20%(m=8)	9.59	8.96		20%	9.12(k=3)	7.28(k=10)
	50%(m=8)	12.32	10.11		50%	14.08(k=3)	9.44(k=10)
	75%(m=16)	29.95	21.17		75%	unconverged	23.68(k=10)
	Open Noise Level	EER(%)			Open Noise Level	EER(%)	
		bs=128	bs=256			bs=128	bs=256
CE	0%	9.26	9.39	AAM	0%	7.70	8.58
	20%	20.96	19.48		20%	9.12	11.12
	50%	28.17	22.64		50%	15.77	13.42
	75%	32.8	30.29		75%	34.58	19.32
GE2E	0%(m=4)	8.80	7.68	AAMSC	0%	6.91(k=3)	7.21(k=10)
	20%(m=8)	10.97	10.06		20%	8.94(k=3)	8.18(k=10)
	50%(m=8)	14.53	12.50		50%	17.94(k=3)	12.50(k=3)
	75%(m=16)	32.76	20.24		75%	unconverged	18.27(k=3)




Figure 1: Our pipeline.

2.1. Label Noising

Suppose we scraped a large scale speaker recognition dataset from the web, two types of label noise, the closed-set and the open-set noise, may exist in the dataset. They can be simulated using a clean dataset \mathcal{D} and an auxiliary dataset \mathcal{D}' that has no class overlap. Given the noise level $q\%$, the simulation can be done as follow.

Close-set (permute) noise. For each utterance in \mathcal{D} , we replace its true label with another label randomly drawn from \mathcal{D} by a chance of $q\%$. It simulates some utterances of an existing (in-distribution) speaker are mistakenly assigned to another existing speaker class.

Open-set noise. For each utterance in \mathcal{D} , we replace itself with another utterance randomly drawn from \mathcal{D}' by a chance of $q\%$, but leaving the label untouched. It simulates some utterances from out-of-distribution speakers are mistakenly assigned to an existing speaker class.

2.2. Training Loss Functions

We investigate the effectiveness of four commonly used loss functions under noisy label settings. Suppose a dataset contains C speaker classes. During training, each mini-batch contains N utterances whose embeddings are \mathbf{x}_i , and the corresponding labels are y_i , where $1 \leq i \leq N$ and $1 \leq y \leq C$.

Softmax Loss (CE). Softmax loss is also known as softmax cross entropy (CE) loss in most classification tasks. It uses a fully-connected layer that maps an embedding to a probability distribution over all classes, which is then used for computing the cross entropy. Softmax loss has the advantage of fast and easy convergence under most circumstances.

Additive Angular Margin Loss (AAM) [23]. We can drop the

bias and normalize the weight in the fully connected layer, and normalize the embedding vector \mathbf{x}_i . The normalization scales everything onto a hypersphere. By doing so, the product is the cosine of the angle between each weight vector and the embedding vector, which is the cosine similarity. We use $\cos(\theta_{j,i})$ to denote the cosine similarity between the class weight j and the speaker i . Now, the original softmax loss can be transformed to Normalised Softmax Loss (NSL).

As the NSL only penalizes classification errors, it does not explicitly enforce intra-class compactness and inter-class separation. AAM resolves this by introducing two stringent requirements. First, AAM imposes an additive angular margin m between each speaker class. A normalized embedding vector can be classified as class i only if $\cos(\theta_{y_i,i} + m)$ is the largest among all other cosine similarities without the margin. Second, AAM scales all cosine similarities by a factor of s , also known as the radius of the hypersphere, to further diversify the target class and the negative class. Note that the AAM might be unstable during training. The easy margin can be turned on to stabilize it.

Sub-center Additive Angular Margin Loss (AAMSC) [24]. CE and AAM considers each class has only one label. AAMSC introduces the idea of sub-class to fortify AAM to combat noisy data. In AAMSC, each label can have K corresponding classes, where K is the size of a class cluster. When training, each embedding may take any class from all class clusters, and for each class clusters, the class with the highest cosine similarity would be selected. The rest procedures are the same with AAM.

Generalised End-to-end Loss (GE2E) [25]. GE2E is a contrastive learning loss. It computes the self-excluded centroid from each batch, maximizes the cosine similarities of utterance-centroid pairs within one class, and minimizes the cosine similarities among different classes. Contrary to CE, AAM, and AAMSC, which uses a fully connected layer as the parameterized classifier, GE2E does not require any parameterized classifier. The centroids calculation and embeddings discrimination are done merely within a batch, and they require speaker grouped batch sampling strategy.

2.3. Noisy Label Detection by Inconsistency Ranking

Clean training samples have consistent patterns, while noisy ones do the opposite. As neural nets are good pattern recognizers, a speaker embedder can learn consistent patterns even from large amount of noise before memorizing noise. We can leverage these learned consistency, and detect the noisy samples according to their inconsistency. The higher the inconsistency of a sample, more likely the sample being mislabeled. Therefore, we propose that noisy samples can be identified by ranking the inter-class and intra-class inconsistency.

Intra-class Inconsistency. A speaker embedder can learn relatively compact representations of the same speaker. We compute each speaker’s embedding centroid, and rank the cosine distances between every utterance and its class centroid. Clean samples should have consistent low distances, while noisy samples should have inconsistent distances, which are usually much higher than clean ones. We define this as the intra-class inconsistency. The speaker centroid is computed by:

$$\mathbf{c}_s = \frac{1}{\sum_u 1} \sum_u \mathbf{x}_{s,u}$$

where \mathbf{x} is the speaker embedding, and s, u are the speaker index and utterance index respectively. The intra-class inconsistency is defined as:

$$\mathbf{I}_d(\mathbf{x}_{s,u}, \mathbf{c}_s) = 1 - \frac{\mathbf{x}_{s,u} \cdot \mathbf{c}_s}{\|\mathbf{x}_{s,u}\|_2 \cdot \|\mathbf{c}_s\|_2}$$

Inter-class Inconsistency. A classifier $\text{CLS}(\cdot; \theta)$ with parameter θ trained along with the embedder can estimate the confidence of whether an utterance belongs to a certain class. Usually, the class that gets the highest confidence is consistent with the label y . However, the classifier may fail to maximize the confidence of the labeled class, or the distinction between class probabilities are tiny, meaning that the classifier is not confident on prediction. Such inter-class inconsistency may suggest that the input sample may have been mislabeled. The inter-class inconsistency is defined as:

$$\mathbf{I}_c = \min(1 - y * \text{CLS}(\mathbf{x}; \theta))$$

As aforementioned, GE2E does not have a parameterized classifier. We manually construct a classifier with the speaker centroids for GE2E. Also, note that when predicting an utterance’s label using AAM and AAMSC, the fully-connected layer is directly applied without considering the margin and the scale.

3. Experiment

VoxCeleb 1 and 2 dataset are pre-processed to MFCC features with sample rate 1.6 kHz, Hanning window, window size 0.025 s, window length 0.01 s, frequency bins 40, and time frames 160. For adding noise, we tested three noise levels $q \in \{20, 50, 75\}$ with two noise types mentioned in Section 2.1. In total, there are 6 noisy datasets and a clean dataset. We use VoxCeleb 2 as the training set and VoxCeleb 1 as the auxiliary set. Our training model is a three-layer LSTM based X-Vector encoder with 768 units with a dense layer with 256 units, which is the speaker embedding size. For testing, we use VoxCeleb 1 testing set to compute the equal error rate (EER) for each model. Note that different hyper-parameters for metric learning losses are tested. We only list the best parameter setting. For NLD, we calculate and rank the inconsistencies, and take the top $q\%$ largest samples as our predicted noisy label. The prediction is then compared with the ground truth to

compute the precision score. Note that during deployment, the prior knowledge of the noise level q is not given, this may be estimated by manually sampling and labeling a small portion of data from the dataset.

4. Results

Table 1 listed all EERs for each combination of noise level, noise type, and loss function. We have the following findings. Firstly, open-set noise is more harmful than permute noise. All loss functions have various performance drop compared to permute under open set noise. CE declines the most, while other losses decline relatively slowly. Secondly, for AAM and AAMSC, their training is unstable, especially when the batch size is small. AAMSC requires careful parameter tuning. With fine-tuned parameters, AAMSC achieved the optimal EER in most cases, yet it is not the case that the larger the number of sub-centers k , the performance would be better. We projected that a large k would introduce too many parameters in the fully-connected layer, results to insufficient training.

Table 2 and 3 listed all NLD precision for each combination of noise level, noise type, and loss function. We have the following findings. Firstly, EER and NLD precision are not strongly correlated. As long as the model can learn to use consistent patterns of clean samples, the noisy label can be well-detected by using metric learning and ranking method. Secondly, for intra-class NLD Precision, AAMSC with proper hyper-parameter performs the best. This shows that AAMSC performs better in pulling noisy labels away from each speaker’s embedding centroid by introducing sub-centers. Interestingly, in some scenarios (50 % noise level), GE2E has very close or better performance to AAMSC in intra-class NLD precision. Thirdly, for inter-class NLD precision, both GE2E and AAM perform well. GE2E shows the best result in permute, and AAM does great in open noise. Very surprisingly, CE out-performs all other loss functions when the noise level is very high (75 %) in inter-class NLD precision. They are even the best compared with intra-class NLD with noise level 75 %.

All four loss functions can yield the best result in different scenarios, but there are some caveats. As mentioned in Section 2.2, AAM and AAMSC may be unstable in training. When hyper-parameters are not properly tuned, training cannot even converge (Table 1). Also as mentioned in Section 2.3, GE2E has no global softmax computation step. We explicitly define how GE2E’s inter-class inconsistency should be computed, which may not align with real training procedure. We reckon that, if the expected noise level is lower than 50 %, intra-class GE2E NLD could provide the best result, as there are fewer hyper-parameters and the training is stable. If the expected noise level is beyond 50 %, CE could probably give the best result with inter-class NLD.

Table 2: *Intra-class NLD Precision*

	Permute Noise Lvl. (%)			Open Noise Lvl. (%)		
	20	50	75	20	50	75%
CE	88.12	76.84	79.61	39.60	24.50	70.39
GE2E	92.74	95.05	79.75	93.37	95.64	76.16
AAM	92.98	93.24	80.63	93.76	94.92	83.68
AAMSC	93.71	93.13	81.00	94.79	96.09	89.17

Table 3: *Inter-class NLD Precision*

	Permute Noise Lvl. (%)			Open Noise Lvl. (%)		
	20	50	75	20	50	75
CE	91.37	93.32	89.90	91.39	94.59	94.38
GE2E	92.93	95.09	88.01	90.27	94.40	89.44
AAM	92.80	92.96	88.25	93.73	95.37	93.57
AAMSC	91.42	92.74	88.33	92.43	94.39	93.43

5. Conclusions and Future Work

In this paper, we extensively reviewed how noise types, noise levels, and loss functions, affect training performance. We also investigated the effectiveness of ranking intra-class inconsistency and inter-class inconsistency in NLD. Our investigation demonstrated that using a model with GE2E loss and intra-class inconsistency NLD method may provide a relatively good NLD performance with less hyper-parameter tuning and training hiccups if the noise level is lower than 50 %, while a model with CE loss and inter-class inconsistency NLD method may be decent if the noise level is very high, at around 75 %.

Though we have drawn a conclusion that what loss function with what NLD methods works well in a given scenario, definitively delineating the inconsistency boundary to decide what are noisy labels or not is still an open question. A possible future work is to investigate whatever statistical models, such as mixture models, can effectively decide whether a label is noisy or not.

6. Acknowledgement

Thanks professor Rita Singh and professor Roger Dannenberg for advising this work.

7. References

- [1] Hui Zhang and Quanming Yao, “Decoupling representation and classifier for noisy label learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.08145*, 2020.
- [2] Zhilu Zhang and Mert Sabuncu, “Generalized cross entropy loss for training deep neural networks with noisy labels,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 31, 2018.
- [3] Giorgio Patrini, Alessandro Rozza, Aditya Krishna Menon, Richard Nock, and Lizhen Qu, “Making deep neural networks robust to label noise: A loss correction approach,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2017, pp. 1944–1952.
- [4] Eric Arazo, Diego Ortego, Paul Albert, Noel O’Connor, and Kevin McGuinness, “Unsupervised label noise modeling and loss correction,” in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2019, pp. 312–321.
- [5] Yisen Wang, Xingjun Ma, Zaiyi Chen, Yuan Luo, Jinfeng Yi, and James Bailey, “Symmetric cross entropy for robust learning with noisy labels,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2019, pp. 322–330.
- [6] Dan Hendrycks, Mantas Mazeika, Duncan Wilson, and Kevin Gimpel, “Using trusted data to train deep networks on labels corrupted by severe noise,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 31, 2018.
- [7] Michal Lukasik, Srinadh Bhojanapalli, Aditya Menon, and Sanjiv Kumar, “Does label smoothing mitigate label noise?,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 6448–6458.
- [8] Lu Jiang, Zhengyuan Zhou, Thomas Leung, Li-Jia Li, and Li Fei-Fei, “Mentornet: Learning data-driven curriculum for very deep neural networks on corrupted labels,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2018, pp. 2304–2313.
- [9] Jacob Goldberger and Ehud Ben-Reuven, “Training deep neural networks using a noise adaptation layer,” 2016.
- [10] Alan Joseph Bekker and Jacob Goldberger, “Training deep neural networks based on unreliable labels,” in *2016 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 2682–2686.
- [11] Junnan Li, Richard Socher, and Steven CH Hoi, “Dividemix: Learning with noisy labels as semi-supervised learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.07394*, 2020.
- [12] Bo Han, Quanming Yao, Xingrui Yu, Gang Niu, Miao Xu, Weihua Hu, Ivor Tsang, and Masashi Sugiyama, “Co-teaching: Robust training of deep neural networks with extremely noisy labels,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 31, 2018.
- [13] Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey Hinton, “A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations,” in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 1597–1607.
- [14] Osamu Akiyama and Junya Sato, “Multitask learning and semisupervised learning with noisy data for audio tagging,” *DCASE2019 Challenge*, 2019.
- [15] Siqi Zheng, Gang Liu, Hongbin Suo, and Yun Lei, “Towards a fault-tolerant speaker verification system: A regularization approach to reduce the condition number,” in *INTERSPEECH*, 2019, pp. 4065–4069.
- [16] David Snyder, Daniel Garcia-Romero, Gregory Sell, Daniel Povey, and Sanjeev 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.
- [17] Seyed Omid Sadjadi, Timothée Kheyrkhan, Audrey Tong, Craig S Greenberg, Douglas A Reynolds, Elliot Singer, Lisa P Mason, Jaime Hernandez-Cordero, et al., “The 2016 nist speaker recognition evaluation,” in *Interspeech*, 2017, pp. 1353–1357.

- [18] Lin Li, Fuchuan Tong, and Qingyang Hong, “When speaker recognition meets noisy labels: Optimizations for front-ends and back-ends,” 2021.
- [19] Minh Pham, Zeqian Li, and Jacob Whitehill, “How does label noise affect the quality of speaker embeddings?,” in *INTER-SPEECH*, 2020, pp. 3216–3220.
- [20] Joon Son Chung, Arsha Nagrani, and Andrew Senior, “Voxceleb2: Deep speaker recognition,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.05622*, 2018.
- [21] Ragav Sachdeva, Filipe R Cordeiro, Vasileios Belagiannis, Ian Reid, and Gustavo Carneiro, “Evidentialmix: Learning with combined open-set and closed-set noisy labels,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, 2021, pp. 3607–3615.
- [22] Xiaoyi Qin, Na Li, Chao Weng, Dan Su, and Ming Li, “Simple attention module based speaker verification with iterative noisy label detection,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.06534*, 2021.
- [23] Jiankang Deng, Jia Guo, Niannan Xue, and Stefanos Zafeiriou, “Arcface: Additive angular margin loss for deep face recognition,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2019, pp. 4690–4699.
- [24] Jiankang Deng, Jia Guo, Tongliang Liu, Mingming Gong, and Stefanos Zafeiriou, “Sub-center arcface: Boosting face recognition by large-scale noisy web faces,” in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2020, pp. 741–757.
- [25] Li Wan, Quan Wang, Alan Papir, and Ignacio Lopez 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.