

Towards Selection of Text-to-speech Data to Augment ASR Training

Shuo Liu^{1,2}, Leda Sari¹, Chunyang Wu¹, Gil Keren¹, Yuan Shangguan¹,
Jay Mahadeokar¹, Ozlem Kalinli¹

¹ Meta AI

² University of Augsburg, Augsburg, Germany

shuo.liu@uni-a.de, ledasari@meta.com

Abstract

This paper presents a method for selecting appropriate synthetic speech samples from a given large text-to-speech (TTS) dataset as supplementary training data for an automatic speech recognition (ASR) model. We trained a neural network, which can be optimised using cross-entropy loss or Arcface loss, to measure the similarity of a synthetic data to real speech. We found that incorporating synthetic samples with considerable dissimilarity to real speech, owing in part to lexical differences, into ASR training is crucial for boosting recognition performance. Experimental results on Librispeech test sets indicate that, in order to maintain the same speech recognition accuracy as when using all TTS data, our proposed solution can reduce the size of the TTS data down below its 30 %, which is superior to several baseline methods.

Index Terms: Data augmentation, text-to-speech, automatic speech recognition, synthetic speech, Transducer

1. Introduction

Speech synthesis, or Text-to-Speech (TTS), is a fast developing technology that generates speech from given text. It has reached the stage that it can create audio that closely resembles natural human voice, allowing for the use of synthetic data to improve the training of Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR) models [1, 2, 3]. Ideally, creating more synthetic data for ASR training has always the potential to improve the accuracy of speech recognition. However, as the quantity of the training data grows, more training time and computational resources are demanded. On the other hand, since TTS speech data are often produced with limited alternative constrains in terms of, for instance, speakers, speech speed and pitch, the resultant synthetic dataset may include a substantial amount of redundancy. Hence, it should be possible to minimise the data size by only choosing more typical and representative samples in a given large TTS dataset to achieve a more cost-efficient ASR training.

Recent research [4, 5] have demonstrated some data selection strategies that are effective for this data reduction purpose. In [4], it is suggested to exploit rejection sampling to accept or reject synthetic samples such that the distribution of the selected synthetic data is close to that of the real speech. The distribution is represented in five dimensions depending on the outputs of a pre-trained ASR model, such as Xent loss, CTC loss, and token lengths, etc. Thus, the chosen synthetic data should own high similarity to actual speech. In [5], the objective is to choose data from a general pool that reflects a domain of interest, in order to build a domain-optimised ASR model. For this purpose, two language models are separately trained on the data from

the target domain and the general domain using discrete speech tokens as input. A domain relevance score is computed based on the output probabilities from the target and general domain language models. The general domain samples scored highest are selected for training the domain specific ASR model. Data selection is also considered essential for training natural language processing (NLP) models efficiently [6, 7]. To empower an NLP model with more lexical information, however, it has been advised to choose the data of low certainty for training so that extra linguistic knowledge may be included.

When selecting TTS data for ASR training, a question remains unanswered is whether we should choose the data that are similar to or distinct from the original real speech. From the acoustic perspective, we may want to select the samples of high similarity to ensure signal quality. However, these data may contain much less additional information and hence can only marginally improve an ASR model; On the other hand, a TTS sample that differs significantly from the original real speech may indicate the synthetic audio is contaminated with noise or artefacts produced during the synthesis process, which can be detrimental to the ASR training. To choose the appropriate TTS data for ASR training, our methodology compromises the similarity and discrepancy of the synthetic and the original real speech. In particular, we use a basic recurrent neural network, a Gated Recurrent Unit (GRU), to generate speech embedding. Then, we compare the embeddings of the real and synthetic speech samples and use two scoring methods to reflect their agreement. For both scoring methods, when selecting the TTS data inside a certain scoring range, we can lower the needed TTS data size while preserving the same level of ASR performance as using all available TTS data.

2. Methodology

The system overview used in this work is given in Figure 1. We generate synthetic speech files from additional text resources using a TTS model. A scoring model is then trained to select some of these audio files that facilitate ASR training. These files are then added to the original real dataset to train an ASR model. For the test phase, we use only real test data.

To develop the scoring model, we train a two-layer Gated Recurrent Unit (GRU) model to extract speech representation from an input audio file. The output of the last time-step is fed into a fully-connected (FC) layer, which is then optimised using binary cross-entropy (BCE) or Arcface loss [8]. When using the BCE loss, the FC output is linearly projected to the two classes, real or synthetic speech, through an additional FC layer. Arcface loss adds a margin parameter to the angle between the normalised speech representation and the weights of the FC layer that is implemented in the loss function. The in-

Work was done when Shuo was interning at Meta AI.



Figure 1: *System overview*

section of the margin tends to increase the separability between speech representations of distinct classes.

Real speech is regarded as class 1 and synthetic speech as class 0 in the training of the GRU model using BCE loss. After training, we calculate the Softmax value of the output logit to score an input audio, and the score of 0.5 can be seen as the threshold for distinguishing between a real or synthetic speech. If the score exceeds 0.5, the input is recognised as a real data, otherwise it is classified as a TTS data. Hence, when a TTS sample’s score is closer to 1, it is more likely to be identified as real data, indicating its higher similarity to real speech. However, as mentioned earlier, a dissimilar TTS sample may provide extra information needed to enhance ASR training. Therefore, it is necessary, however challenging, to find a proper scoring range for selecting the appropriate TTS data.

A more straightforward approach to quantify the similarity between real and synthetic speech is to compute the cosine similarity of their speech representations. In an attempt to improve the representation separability, Arcface loss is applied to the GRU model’s optimisation. Based on the real samples in training set, we next calculate the average embedding for real speech, named as average real embedding. To score a TTS sample, the cosine similarity between its embedding and the average real embedding is computed. Again, the TTS samples scored with low similarity to real speech may signal the presence of new information that has the chance to contribute to the ASR training. Notably, since our proposed method exploits only a simple neural network, it allows the rapid scoring of synthetic speech samples compared to previous work that typically relies on a pre-trained ASR model, particularly when the size of the involved TTS dataset is enormous.

3. Experiments

3.1. Dataset

Our scoring models are trained based on the LibriSpeech corpus [9]. It consists of around 960 hours of read, clean speech derived from over 8 000 public domain audiobooks and has its own train, development, and test splits. We apply the TTS model described in Section 3.2 to the Librispeech transcriptions to generate the synthetic audio files. During training, the performance of the scoring models are monitored on the Librispeech development set without touching the test set. As additional text resources to generate the synthetic speech files for ASR training, we employ 10 % of data from the language model (LM) corpus provided in Librispeech corpus, yielding a total of 4.11 million utterances.

3.2. TTS & ASR Models

The TTS model has a multi-stage framework. It begins with a rule-based Grapheme-to-Phoneme (G2P) Conversion module that transforms the input text into various levels of linguistic

representations. These features are consumed by a prosody model [10] and a spectrum model [11] to generate spectrum features. The prosody model consists of multiple Transformer layers [12], with each layer contains a multi-head attention module and a feed-forward layer. In addition, residual connection and layer normalisation are performed to each transformer layer. Finally, a neural vocoder using WaveRNN architecture [13] is used to transform the features into audio waveform.

The ASR model used in this work processes a log Mel-spectrogram with 80 Mel bands, the spectrogram is created by taking the Short-time Fourier transform (STFT) of a speech signal with a window size of 25ms and hop size of 10ms. SpecAugment is applied to strengthen the robustness of the ASR model [14]. The model has the output vocabulary of 5000 sentence pieces [15] estimated over the 960-hours Librispeech training set [9] (LS 960h). The Mel-spectrogram is linearly projected to 128 channels using an encoder, and every four time steps are concatenated along the feature dimensionality to squeeze the total frames. Then a stack of 20 efficient memory transformer (Emformer [16]) layers are used to capture the temporal context. The Emformer output is then fed into a recurrent neural transducer (RNN-T). Using a 3-layer LSTM model [17], the Emformer predictor generates embeddings of the size of 512 based on all the previous predicted symbols. The outputs of the Emformer encoder and predictor are combined and projected to a probability distribution over a vocabulary.

3.3. Settings

For a fair comparison of different data selection methods, the training parameters for all the ASR models developed throughout this work are consistent. The models are optimised by minimising the transducer loss using an Adam optimiser with an initial learning rate of 0.001. The total number of training epochs is 200, and beginning with the 60 epoch, the learning rate annealing is applied at a shrink rate of 0.96 per epoch. The maximum number of tokens in a training batch is capped to 40000 with the number of utterances not exceeding 1000. The ASR models are trained using 32 A100 GPU units.

Both layers of our GRU scoring model have hidden units of 256. The dimensionality of the subsequent fully-connected layer is set to 64 when the model is trained with BCE loss. Its optimisation employs a batch size of 64 and Adam optimiser with a fixed learning rate of 0.0001. When using Arcface loss for training, the scale and margin parameters are set to 10 and 0.5, respectively. A lower learning rate of 0.00001 is applied to ensure stable convergence.

3.4. Baseline Methods

As the primary comparison result, we first evaluate the effect of adding all available TTS data to the original Librispeech training set as the new training data. In addition, we compare our data selection approach with three baseline methods: ran-

Table 1: Testing results, WER [%], of different data selection approaches on Librispeech test set. # add. utter indicates the number of TTS samples selected to be added to Librispeech 960h (LS) training data. The proportion of utterances selected from the synthetic samples generated based on LM text database are additionally given, where “high” and “low” denote the TTS samples are selected from those with highest or lowest scores, respectively. The binary classifiers are trained using Cross-entropy (Xent) or Arcface loss.

Method	# add. utter. [M]	dev-clean	test-clean	dev-other	test-other
LS	—	3.2	3.5	9.2	8.7
LS + all synthetic speech	4.11 (100 %)	2.67	2.97	8.39	8.05
Random	1.23 (30 %)	2.87	3.21	8.63	8.63
Confidence score	1.23 (30 % high)	3.10	3.24	8.90	8.65
	1.23 (30 % low)	2.77	3.05	8.46	8.28
ULM accuracy	1.50 (36 % high)	2.72	2.97	8.63	8.22
	1.23 (30 % low)	2.91	3.13	8.58	8.31
ULM perplexity	1.50 (36 % high)	2.87	2.99	8.96	8.35
	1.23 (30 % low)	2.76	3.01	8.39	8.20
Binary classifier (Xent)	1.10 (27 %)	2.78	2.96	8.42	8.16
Binary classifier (Arcface)	1.23 (30 %)	2.81	2.97	8.46	8.09

dom selection, a method depending on confidence score, and an acoustic unit language model-based scoring method. Confidence score represents the joiner score of the word-pieces making up the words in an utterance. We consider the selection of TTS samples with the highest and lowest confidence scores for ASR training. We compare our methods with these baseline methods on the test sets of Librispeech in terms of word error rate (WER).

The scoring method using an acoustic unit language model (ULM) is inspired by [5]. The acoustic units are obtained by a Hidden-Unit BERT (HuBERT) model [18] which is a self-supervised speech model. To emulate a written language having a finite vocabulary of discrete units, a HuBERT model produces the discrete speech representation by directly processing a speech waveform. The pseudo labels for HuBERT training are created by performing unsupervised clustering, such as K-means, on the MFCCs of the input signal. Hence, the learnt discrete speech representation is optimised to be close to the centroid of its belonging cluster, and far from other cluster centroids. It has been shown that fine-tuning a HuBERT model for ASR can reach state-of-the-art results [19]. In this work, we deploy a HuBERT model trained using K-means clustering method with $K = 100$. A 13-layer neural LM is trained to predict the next HuBERT unit for a given sequence of input HuBERT units. Please note that this LM is not a conventional text-based LM but one which is trained on discrete speech units and hence, it has the ability to model the acoustic properties. In order to obtain a score per utterance, we used either the average next unit prediction accuracy or the perplexity.

3.5. Results

The ASR model trained using the original Librispeech training set achieves a WER of 3.5 % on the test-clean split and 8.7 % on the test-other split (Table 1). Adding all of our generated TTS data, which consists of 4.11 million synthetic speech files, as additional training material decreases the WER results on the evaluation sets to 2.97 % and 8.05 %, respectively. We assess our scoring methods for selecting a subset of the TTS audio files for ASR training while aiming to keep the same effectiveness of WER reduction. With the allowance of 2 % rising rate, we expect the resulting WER on test-clean to be lower than 3.03 %, and on the test-other to be lower than 8.24 %

As seen in Table 1, the data selection methods based on ULM can produce superior results than the other two baseline

methods, namely random selection and confidence score-based scoring. Using the average next unit prediction perplexity as the criterion for data selection, 30 % of the synthetic audio files with the lowest scores yields a WER of 3.01 % on the test-clean set and 8.20 % on the test-other set. To attain the same level of performance, however, we need to incorporate 1.5 million TTS samples with the highest accuracy scores when choosing the data based on the average prediction accuracy. In particular, the trained ASR can reach the same WER on the test-clean set as using all of the TTS data available, and a WER of 8.22 on the test-other split.

Instead of choosing the highest or lowest scored samples, as was the case with baseline methods, we discovered that our binary classification-based scoring approaches perform best when employing the TTS data within a medium scoring range. In other words, the synthetic audio files that can be differentiated from real speech samples are more beneficial for improving the ASR performance. After training our GRU scoring model using BCE loss, we acquire an unweighted average recall of 92 % classification accuracy on the Librispeech validation set. In particular, the recall score reaches approximately 100 % for real speech (class 1), and 83 % for synthetic speech (class 0), demonstrating that almost all the real speech samples can be identified accurately while some of the TTS samples are incorrectly recognised as real speech. The scoring model’s prediction output are then used to score the TTS samples created from LM text resources. The WER can be reduced to 2.96 % and 8.16 % for the test-clean and test-other sets, respectively, by choosing only 27 % of the synthetic audio files rated between 0.2 and 0.5. Similar to this, when using Arcface loss to train the GRU model, we can successfully select TTS data that yields an even better result on the test-other set, a WER of 8.09 %, by selecting 30 % of all TTS audio files which have similarity scores within the range of 0.2 to 0.8.

4. Discussion

To support our recommended scoring ranges for TTS data selection, i.e., score between 0.2 and 0.5 for the GRU scoring model trained with BCE loss, similarity between 0.2 to 0.8 similarity for the scoring model trained with Arcface loss, we compare their effectiveness to the data scored outside the range. Specifically, for the first scoring model, we randomly select synthetic samples from those scored between 0.2 and 0.5 as the same size of the samples scored greater than 0.5, and compare their effec-

Table 2: *Informativeness Comparison in three scoring range using our binary classifier trained with cross-entropy or Arcface loss.*

Method	Scoring range	# add. utter. [M]	dev-clean	test-clean	dev-other	test-other
Binary classifier (Xent)	$Score > 0.5$	0.77 (18 %)	3.06	3.20	8.95	8.58
	$0.2 < Score < 0.5$		2.85	3.11	8.67	8.17
	$Score < 0.2$	1.10 (27 %)	2.80	3.13	8.48	8.42
	$0.2 < Score < 0.5$		2.78	2.96	8.42	8.16
Binary classifier (Arcface)	$Similarity > 0.8$	1.22 (30 %)	2.85	3.04	8.60	8.34
	$0.2 < Similarity < 0.8$		2.81	2.97	8.46	8.09
	$Similarity < 0.2$	0.77 (18 %)	2.96	3.25	9.03	8.45
	$0.2 < Similarity < 0.8$		2.91	3.00	8.39	8.19

Table 3: *Number of words existing in Librispeech evaluation set, but not in training set, in terms of different scoring range from binary classifier trained with cross-entropy loss. Number of TTS sentences that contain these words.*

Scoring range	# add. utter. [M]	Words				Utterances			
		dev-clean	test-clean	dev-other	test-other	dev-clean	test-clean	dev-other	test-other
$Score > 0.5$	0.77 (18 %)	48	46	49	66	290	322	234	378
$0.2 < Score < 0.5$	2.24 (55 %)	157	151	156	182	1073	1191	927	1285
$Score < 0.2$	1.10 (27 %)	133	108	118	149	674	711	514	824

Table 4: *Testing results, WER [%], of classification scoring methods on Librispeech test set, after removing the LM TTS utterances containing unseen words.*

Method	Unseen words	dev-clean	test-clean	dev-other	test-other
Bin. cls. (Xent)	✗	2.90	3.09	8.74	8.30
	✓	2.78	2.96	8.42	8.16
Bin. cls. (Arcface)	✗	2.88	3.07	8.65	8.20
	✓	2.81	2.97	8.46	8.09

Table 5: *Testing results, WER [%], by using the TTS data selected by both ULM and our data selection approaches.*

Method	# add. utter. [M]	dev-clean	test-clean	dev-other	test-other
ULM accuracy & Bin. cls. (Xent)	0.72 (18 %)	2.90	3.02	8.81	8.23
ULM accuracy & Bin. cls. (Arcface)	0.71 (17 %)	2.89	3.05	8.83	8.26
LM accuracy & Bin. cls. (Xent) & Bin. cls. (Arcface)	0.65 (16 %)	2.89	3.06	8.67	8.28

tiveness in ASR improvement. Similar comparison has been made for the TTS samples with scores under 0.2. The random selection was performed 5 times for each comparison, and the averaged outcomes, shown in Table 2, reveal that the TTS samples from our suggested scoring range are more effective in ASR improvement compared to the top- and bottom-scoring samples. However, the samples scored below 0.2 are also not very helpful for ASR, as shown in Table 2. This lower-score boundary has been established experimentally; however, its determination can be challenging in practice. Thus, it is suggested to simply choose the highest-scoring TTS samples right below 0.5. Similarly, for the second scoring model, the TTS samples with too high or too low similarity to real speech are not as competitive as the samples with similarity between 0.2 and 0.8 in terms of ASR improvement. Overall, we are able to optimize the ASR performance using TTS samples while excluding samples that are too similar or too dissimilar to real speech.

The results are partly due to the inclusion of out-of-vocabulary words in LM texts like Table 2, supporting the idea

that we should select TTS data with enough uncertainty as additional ASR training material.

These results are partially attributable to the incorporation of some extra unseen words given by LM text resources, and as a result, the selected data provide more additional information to benefit ASR training. In Table 3, we list the number of out-of-vocabulary words that are included in the evaluation splits of the Librispeech dataset and added to the new training set due to LM texts. An utterance containing these unseen words may have a lower similarity to the original training samples, but including them in ASR training can help to improve speech recognition accuracy. If the selected utterances containing these unseen words are filtered out for other utterances without them in the same scoring range, the results provided in Table 4 show that the speech recognition performance for both of our scoring methods declines to some extent.

In an effort to further reduce the required TTS data size, we additionally investigate the combination of our classification-based scoring method with the ULM scoring method. Only the data chosen by both approaches is used to train ASR models, and the best-performing combination is given in Table 5. Combining ULM accuracy and a binary classifier (Xent) retains the WER results of 3.02 and 8.23 on the test-clean and test-other sets while only requiring 0.72 million of TTS samples, or about 18 % of the total generated TTS data. However, the WER rise on the development set raises the question of the validity of this ASR model in practical use.

5. Conclusions

In this paper, we presented a solution for selecting useful samples from a given large TTS dataset to augment the ASR training data. Our method uses a simple neural network to produce agreement between real and synthetic speech. Experimental results indicated that the ASR benefits from choosing synthetic data that are of sufficient additional information or uncertainty, resulting in better speech recognition performance compared to other existing methods that consider the maximum or minimum amount of agreement.

6. References

- [1] A. Rosenberg, Y. Zhang, B. Ramabhadran, Y. Jia, P. Moreno, Y. Wu, and Z. Wu, "Speech recognition with augmented synthesized speech," in *IEEE Automatic Speech Recognition and Understanding Workshop (ASRU)*, Sentosa, Singapore, 2019, pp. 996–1002.
- [2] G. Wang, A. Rosenberg, Z. Chen, Y. Zhang, B. Ramabhadran, Y. Wu, and P. Moreno, "Improving speech recognition using consistent predictions on synthesized speech," in *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, Barcelona, Spain, 2020, pp. 7029–7033.
- [3] S. Ueno, M. Mimura, S. Sakai, and T. Kawahara, "Data augmentation for asr using tts via a discrete representation," in *IEEE Automatic Speech Recognition and Understanding Workshop (ASRU)*, Cartagena, Colombia, 2021, pp. 68–75.
- [4] T. Hu, M. Armandpour, A. Shrivastava, J. R. Chang, H. Koppula, and O. Tuzel, "Synt++: Utilizing imperfect synthetic data to improve speech recognition," in *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, Singapore, Singapore, 2022, pp. 7682–7686.
- [5] Z. Lu, Y. Wang, Y. Zhang, W. Han, Z. Chen, and P. Haghani, "Unsupervised data selection via discrete speech representation for ASR," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.01981*, 2022.
- [6] B. Settles and M. Craven, "An analysis of active learning strategies for sequence labeling tasks," in *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2008, pp. 1070–1079.
- [7] R. Hazra, P. Dutta, S. Gupta, M. A. Qaathir, and A. Dukkupati, "Active² learning: Actively reducing redundancies in active learning methods for sequence tagging and machine translation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.00234*, 2019.
- [8] J. Deng, J. Guo, N. Xue, and S. Zafeiriou, "Arcface: Additive angular margin loss for deep face recognition," in *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, Long Beach, CA, USA, 2019, pp. 4685–4694.
- [9] V. Panayotov, G. Chen, D. Povey, and S. Khudanpur, "Librispeech: an asr corpus based on public domain audio books," in *2015 IEEE international conference on acoustics, speech and signal processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 5206–5210.
- [10] Q. He, Z. Xiu, T. Koehler, and J. Wu, "Multi-rate attention architecture for fast streamable text-to-speech spectrum modeling," in *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, Toronto, Canada, 2021, pp. 5689–5693.
- [11] C. Wu, Z. Xiu, Y. Shi, O. Kalinli, C. Fuegen, T. Koehler, and Q. He, "Transformer-Based Acoustic Modeling for Streaming Speech Synthesis," in *Proc. Interspeech 2021*, Shanghai, China, 2021, pp. 146–150.
- [12] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, Ł. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin, "Attention is all you need," Long Beach, CA, USA, 2017.
- [13] N. Kalchbrenner, E. Elsen, K. Simonyan, S. Noury, N. Casagrande, E. Lockhart, F. Stimberg, A. van den Oord, S. Dieleman, and K. Kavukcuoglu, "Efficient neural audio synthesis," in *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2018, pp. 2410–2419.
- [14] D. S. Park, W. Chan, Y. Zhang, C.-C. Chiu, B. Zoph, E. D. Cubuk, and Q. V. Le, "SpecAugment: A simple data augmentation method for automatic speech recognition," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.08779*, 2019.
- [15] T. Kudo and J. Richardson, "Sentencepiece: A simple and language independent subword tokenizer and detokenizer for neural text processing," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.06226*, 2018.
- [16] Y. Shi, Y. Wang, C. Wu, C.-F. Yeh, J. Chan, F. Zhang, D. Le, and M. Seltzer, "Emformer: Efficient memory transformer based acoustic model for low latency streaming speech recognition," in *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2021, pp. 6783–6787.
- [17] S. Hochreiter and J. Schmidhuber, "Long short-term memory," *Neural computation*, vol. 9, no. 8, pp. 1735–1780, 1997.
- [18] W.-N. Hsu, B. Bolte, Y.-H. H. Tsai, K. Lakhotia, R. Salakhutdinov, and A. Mohamed, "Hubert: Self-supervised speech representation learning by masked prediction of hidden units," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 29, pp. 3451–3460, 2021.
- [19] S. wen Yang, P.-H. Chi, Y.-S. Chuang, C.-I. J. Lai, K. Lakhotia, Y. Y. Lin, A. T. Liu, J. Shi, X. Chang, G.-T. Lin, T.-H. Huang, W.-C. Tseng, K. tik Lee, D.-R. Liu, Z. Huang, S. Dong, S.-W. Li, S. Watanabe, A. Mohamed, and H. yi Lee, "SUPERB: Speech processing universal performance benchmark," in *Proc. Interspeech*, Brno, Czech Republic, 2021, pp. 1194–1198.