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Abstract—Many audio applications, such as environmental sound analysis, are increasingly using general-purpose audio representations for transfer learning. The robustness of such representations has been determined by evaluating them across a variety of domains and applications. However, it is unclear how the application-specific evaluation can be utilized to predict the impact of variability in real-world deployments caused by myriad microphones’ range and acoustic conditions, commonly known as channel effects. In this paper, we integrate the results of various distance metrics with downstream performance to make a more informed prediction of how robust the representations or embeddings are to the audio channel effects. To accomplish this, we use two embeddings, YAMNet and OpenL3, and three distance metrics to quantify the change in the embeddings when injecting perturbations to the audio signal that imitate channel effects. In monophonic (UrbanSound8K) and polyphonic (SONYC UST) data, we show that a combination of two distances, Fréchet Audio Distance (FAD) and Cophenetic Correlation Distance (CPCD), correlates well with the effects of perturbations. We further discuss the limitations of each distance measure.

Index Terms—Self-supervised learning, robust audio embeddings, transfer learning, acoustic perturbations

I. INTRODUCTION

Scarcity of large amount of labeled data for supervised learning in applications related to environmental sounds has popularized the use of representation learning and transfer learning [1]–[4]. As part of this learning paradigm, a network is pre-trained on an upstream task which has availability of large datasets to learn generic representations or embeddings that can be used to transfer-learn classifier(s) on a variety of related target downstream application(s). Having access to such vast amounts of upstream data [5] allows pre-trained models to be over-parameterized, which has been shown to be the an essential element in attaining generalization [6]. This has been shown to be true for audio classification scenarios [1], and the hope is that the learnt representations are more robust and therefore not sensitive to small changes, also called perturbations in the audio signal.

Recent works have addressed robustness by assessing the embeddings’ classification performance in a downstream task(s) [7]. This has been popularized by recent challenges and benchmarks, organized first within the computer vision community [8], and more recently in the machine listening community, e.g. Holistic Audio Representation Evaluation Suite (HARES) [9], Holistic Evaluation of Audio Representations (HEAR) [10]. The HEAR challenge is the largest effort to date to evaluate audio representations. Several embeddings were submitted and ranked across different downstream tasks including music, speech and environmental sound.

These approaches, while valuable, do not provide information regarding the stability of such embeddings in response to specific changes in the data, and hence do not aid in understanding what to expect when employing them in real-world applications under various conditions. Furthermore, using labeled data to assess embedding has the inherent drawback of requiring human annotations, making it difficult to scale to multiple contexts and applications. While researchers have attempted to circumvent the data limitation by artificially degrading audio signals [11], [12] with tools such as ADT [13] or Scaper [14], the robustness analysis remains “solely” dependent on the end application.

In the deep learning community, approaches to robustness are often performed by applying different mathematical transformations or perturbations to the input of a deep learning model, and theoretically assessing its impact on the output, followed by experimental validation [15], [16]. The advantage of these approaches is that they are task-agnostic and thus have the potential to generalize to a larger umbrella of applications. Our evaluation pipeline is inspired by these methods. In this paper, we propose to use distance metrics to compare the shift solely in the embedding space, making the evaluation methodology task-free. We further correlate the metrics with the downstream results to corroborate the findings and establish relationship between the perturbations and the downstream evaluation. We leverage two publicly available audio embedding models, OpenL3 [1] and YAMNet [4] to build on the findings from the HEAR challenge, where OpenL3 and YAMNet were reported to be among the best and worst performing models, respectively.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows: 1) We propose a principled methodology to evaluate robustness of
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audio embeddings against channel effects, both qualitatively and quantitatively, in a task-free setting. 2) We investigate the use and limitations of three distance measures for analyzing changes in pairwise distance, topology, and distribution in order to gain insight into downstream performance. 3) We mimic channel effects with four basic perturbations: high pass (HP) and low pass (LP) filtering, gain and reverberation and show gain and reverberation to be more robust to channel effects than both HP and LP. 4) We show YAMNet to be less robust than OpenL³ against the four perturbations.

II. ROBUSTNESS TO PERTURBATION

Let $X = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be a dataset of $n$ audio snippets and $\theta$ be the parameters of the upstream embedding model $f(x, \theta) \rightarrow e_x$ that maps audio input $x$ to an embedding $e_x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. $E = \{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is the set of all such $n$ embeddings. Also, consider a transformation function $\phi(x) \rightarrow \hat{x}$ that perturbs the audio signal $x$ to $\hat{x}$. The new audio set $\hat{X}$ then produces a new embedding space $\hat{E} = \{\hat{e}_i\}_{i=1}^n$. The robustness problem is then stated as follows: the embedding space $\hat{E}$ produced by the upstream model on the perturbed audio set should not change the semantics of the audio signal i.e. $E$ should be similar to $\hat{E}$. We list different distance metrics to measure the variation between the two embedding spaces in section III-A.

We investigate four perturbations, namely high pass and low pass filtering, gain and reverberation. These perturbations are inspired from channel effects that arise when deploying audio sensing devices in urban settings, and simulate varying conditions both in the acoustic propagation from the source to the recording device and in the recording device itself. The range of values on which we explore each perturbation is listed in Table I.

III. EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

The pipeline to calculate a distance measure to quantify the effect of a perturbation $\phi$ on an embedding space $E$ is shown in Fig. 1. The embedding space modeling function $g$ is unique for each distance metric, and we list them below along with the metric. 

A. Distance Metrics to Evaluate Robustness

To motivate the use of different distance measures, we leverage a toy dataset of five random co-ordinates in Fig. 2. Even minor perturbations, such as those in 1a and 1b, change the pairwise distances between the old and new points. But, the relative distance between them in the new space is preserved which is evident from the hierarchical clustering in 2a and 2b. Similarly, scaling by a constant factor of 2 clusters the new points same as that in the original dataset but changes the mean of new distribution. Motivated by the unique qualitative and quantitative information provided by various metrics, we investigate distance measures to evaluate shift between the original and the perturbed embeddings in three aspects: (1) pairwise distances, (2) relative pairwise distances (as in hierarchical clustering), and (3) distribution.

Pairwise: When comparing embeddings, the most prevalent method has been to use some sort of pairwise distance. We
choose cosine similarity, which is identical to Euclidean distance of normalized vectors, because it is common to normalize embeddings before training the downstream classifier. To change similarity into distance, we use cosine distance (CD). To generate a single distance value for the full embedding set, we average all of the CD. Since CD uses each embedding pair \((e_i, \hat{e}_i)\) without any transformation, the function \(g\) in Fig. 1 is an identity function.

**Topology:** As shown in Fig. 2a-2d, even when the relative distances between the data points do not vary as observed in clustering, pairwise distances might change dramatically. To make the pairwise study less stringent and distance-free, we evaluate the total change in the pairwise proximity of the embeddings in \(E\) and \(\hat{E}\). We use agglomerative clustering with euclidean distance and average linkage criterion to create dendrograms for the original and perturbed embeddings. The branching patterns (also known as topology) in the two dendrograms might differ in terms of the embedding positions in the leaf-set. To quantify the difference, we calculate the Pearson correlation coefficient (PCC) between the cophenetic distance matrices, \(C_o\) and \(C_p\), for the dendrograms corresponding to the original and perturbed embeddings. We utilize \(g\) to convert the correlation into a distance metric, which we refer to as cophenetic correlation distance (CPCD).

\[
PCC = \frac{\text{cov}(C_o, C_p)}{\sqrt{\text{var}(C_o)\text{var}(C_p)}}
\]

\[
\text{CPCD} = 1 - PCC
\]

where \(\text{cov}\) and \(\text{var}\) correspond to covariance and variance respectively and are determined as an output of function \(g\) in Fig. 1.

**Distribution:** In order to get the variation in the distribution within the embedding space, we leverage the Fréchet Audio Distance (FAD). Initially proposed for music enhancement application, Kilgour et al. [21] use FAD to compare the embedding statistics generated on a large reference set of clean music with the embedding statistics generated on an evaluation set of enhanced noisy signals. We, on the other hand, use it to compare the statistics between the original and the perturbed embedding set. The function \(g\) in Fig. 1 models the embeddings as a multivariate Gaussian. The Fréchet distance (also known as Wasserstein-2 distance) between the Gaussian of the original embeddings \(N_o(\mu_o, \Sigma_o)\) and the perturbed embeddings \(N_p(\mu_p, \Sigma_p)\) is then computed as:

\[
FAD(N_o, N_p) = ||\mu_o - \mu_p||^2 + \text{tr}(\Sigma_o + \Sigma_p - 2\sqrt{\Sigma_o \Sigma_p})
\]

where \(\mu\) represent the mean, \(\Sigma\) the covariance matrix, and \(\text{tr}\) the trace. Unlike the cosine and the correlation distance, FAD is oblivious to the way the embeddings are related to one other and is used primarily to investigate the change in the overall embedding distribution (c.f. 1c and 1d in Fig. 2).

**B. Datasets**

We study the robustness of both OpenL3 and YAMNet for two popular datasets, namely UrbanSound8K (US8K) [22], and UST [23]. These datasets are complementary to those used in the HEAR challenge for environmental sound. For the UST dataset, we use all the 1380 recordings with verified annotations in v2.3. As for the US8K samples, we use all the \(\sim 8K\) samples. To simplify the analysis, we sample one embedding per clip, which we select by computing the sound pressure levels (SPL) of the clip and retrieving the embedding where the SPL is highest. The assumption behind this is that the highest SPL level correlates with the presence of a labeled sound source.

**IV. Evaluation**

**A. Comparison of representation types**

For both CD and CPCD, YAMNet shows a larger distance as compared to OpenL3. To get a deeper understanding in
Fig. 3: CD, CPCD, and FAD for US8K and UST datasets for four perturbation types. The x-axis values for each perturbation range from a minor to a large change. The sampling frequency of YAMNet (Y) and OpenL3 (O) is 16kHz and 44.1kHz, respectively. (d) compares the classification accuracy of the original (orig) and perturbed (pert) embeddings for US8K.

Fig. 4: Silhouette scores of OpenL3 and YAMNet for US8K

YAMNet’s sensitivity to pairwise relations, we calculate the silhouette scores of the embeddings of each class in US8K. In Fig. 4, we observe that YAMNet produces a negative silhouette score of −0.14 even for the original representations, meaning that embeddings of the same class lack the two qualities of separability from embeddings of other classes and cluster compactness. Even a tiny modification can modify the pairwise groups in this scenario. Additionally, we observe that in circumstances where a shallow downstream model is used with no fine-tuning, the silhouette scores itself provides a good indication of downstream performance.

Despite the fact that OpenL3’s distribution show more variation than YAMNet for US8K (c.f. Fig. 3c), large values of CPCD for YAMNet in Fig. 3b is indicative of the fact that the YAMNet’s pairwise relationships change significantly in the perturbed space, and can possibly affect the downstream performance. Fig. 3d confirms this hypothesis. Note that in order to re-scale FAD to a 0-1 scale, we use Min-Max scaling within a dataset to normalize FAD scores, which somewhat skews the comparison but has no effect on the overall trend.

B. Comparison of distance metrics

FAD closely approximates the relative performance drops as the severity of the perturbation increases. We illustrate this by comparing the FAD trend with the downstream evaluation on the perturbed US8K embeddings. Specifically, we train a logistic regression with the original US8K embeddings $E$ and use it to predict the accuracy on the perturbed embeddings $\hat{E}$. As shown in Fig. 3d, OpenL3 has a steeper change in the accuracy than YAMNet. Nevertheless, even when OpenL3 produces the lowest accuracy (high pass at 8k Hz), it is better than YAMNet. One can infer the same by considering both FAD and CPCD simultaneously, as stated in Section IV-A. Both CD and CPCD utilize pairwise information, and are comparatively more sensitive to noise and outliers. We recommend to always supplement such pairwise metrics with information from other robust metrics like FAD.

Furthermore, because FAD best reflects the performance loss, it may be used for data augmentation to make the
downstream classifier more robust. In particular, different perturbations can be tested, and those with higher values in this metric can be used in the augmentation.

C. Comparison of perturbation types

The embeddings are more robust to gain and reverb than to high and low pass filtering. This is expected since these perturbations do not significantly change the information contained in the signal (much less than low and high pass filtering), so the fact that the embeddings are robust to them is a good indication that the models are doing what we expect and they are learning mostly semantic information. The inflection point indication that the models are doing what we expect and they are learning mostly semantic information. The inflection point indicates that the models are doing what we expect and they are learning mostly semantic information.

The inflection point indicates that the models are doing what we expect and they are learning mostly semantic information.

V. Conclusion

We employ three distance metrics to estimate the effect of channel effects on two representations, OpenL3 and YAMNet. We demonstrate that the downstream performance and the distance measures are complementary. Limiting the evaluation to downstream performance precludes a more in-depth study of the reason as well as extrapolation of the findings to other real-world test scenarios. Similarly, focusing simply on distance measurement might lead to incorrect conclusions, particularly if multiple measures are not taken into account at the same time. The combination of FAD and CPCD is the most useful and representative of downstream trends. Besides, FAD can help choose among different perturbations to be used as augmentations for making sound event detection models more robust.

As a future work, we intend to repeat this study for a wide variety of embeddings and datasets, and also extend the analysis to include correlations between distance metrics and different sound event classes.
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