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Abstract—Pre-trained models are essential as feature extractors in modern machine learning systems in various domains. In this study, we hypothesize that representations effective for general audio tasks should provide multiple aspects of robust features of the input sound. For recognizing sounds regardless of perturbations such as varying pitch or timbre, features should be robust to these perturbations. For serving the diverse needs of tasks such as recognition of emotions or music genres, representations should provide multiple aspects of these robust features, such as local and global features and their statistics. To implement our principle, we propose a self-supervised learning method: Bootstrap Your Own Latent (BYOL) for Audio (BYOL-A, pronounced "viola"). BYOL-A pre-trains representations of the input sound themselves invariant to audio data augmentations by minimizing the difference between a pair of augmented input variants, which makes the learned representations robust to the perturbations of sounds. In the BYOL-A encoder, the global pooling calculates representations to form multi-aspect information by combining statistics of frequency- and channel-wise, local, and global features. As a result, the learned representations should provide multi-aspect robust features of the input and serve various needs of diverse tasks. We evaluated general audio task performance among previous state-of-the-art methods, and BYOL-A showed competitive results in all tasks with the best average result of 72.4 %. Besides, BYOL-A sets new records of 57.6 % on VoxCeleb1 and 63.8 % on CREMA-D.

We also conducted extensive ablation experiments and validated the contributions of BYOL-A components. Our code is available online.

Index Terms—Representation learning, General-purpose audio representation, Self-supervised learning, BYOL.

I. INTRODUCTION

Pre-trained models play a vital role as feature extractors in various domains, e.g., BERT [1] in the natural language processing domain and ImageNet pre-trained models [2] [3] [4] in the image domain. In the audio domain, pre-trained models (e.g., VGGish [5]) have enabled recent advances in applications such as heart sound classification [6], Alzheimer’s disease detection [7], conservation monitoring [8], audio captioning [9], audio retrieval [10], and so forth.

Various audio pre-trained models have been proposed for supervised learning [12] [13] [14] [15] or unsupervised learning [16] [17] [18] [19] [20] [21] methods, and they have been evaluated on target tasks such as sound event recognition (SER) [22] [23] [24] [25], non-semantic speech (NOSS) [19] (e.g., speech command recognition [26], speaker identification [27]), and music tasks (e.g., music genre [28] and instrument [29] classification).

Our goal is to explore pre-trained audio representations for general audio tasks; however, we see both conflicting and common needs in various task settings. For example, we recognize words while ignoring who is speaking in the speech commands task; we identify speakers while ignoring speech content words in the identification task. In contrast to these conflicts, we commonly ignore slight differences such as pitch, duration, or timbre in these tasks. These suggest that while multiple information may serve conflicting needs, ignoring slight differences may serve the common needs.

If we focus on the encoder neural networks, previous studies benefit from fusing multiple features in different layers [30] [31] [32]. On CNNs in particular, it is known that early layers, local features, contain relatively "general" filters, whereas deeper layers, global features, are specific to the training dataset [33]. These suggest that multi-aspect features available in layers potentially serve various needs.
In the CNN encoder, the global pooling summarizes multi-dimensional features into a vector, which may decrease available information. Typical global poolings are flattening and statistics such as averaging and max operation. While flattening preserves all the information, summarizing in statistics reduces available information.

However, the global pooling with statistics is valuable for packing variable-length audio into a fixed-length vector. To this end, previous studies apply pooling operations in time, such as temporal average or max pooling [16] [34] [35]. Moreover, combining both temporal average and max pooling can benefit from their advantages [12].

To summarize what could potentially work to meet various task needs, we hypothesize that effective representations should provide multiple aspects of robust features of the input sound. These robust features should preserve sufficient details while being invariant to sound perturbations, and the multiple aspects of these features should be combined with the statistics available in the encoder. Then, the resulting representations should serve to meet the various conflicting and common needs of tasks.

For learning to preserve sufficient detail, we think the training signal has to describe the input in details. But supervised learning labels cannot describe each input; these cannot enumerate individual speaker identities for example. Self-supervision, such as cross-modal correspondence and the temporal relationship between audio segments, does not describe the details of input sounds. We believe that the input data is the best training signal itself.

For making the input data itself as the supervision, image self-supervised learning Bootstrap Your Own Latent (BYOL) [11] is suitable. BYOL learns representations of input invariant to augmentations by comparing augmented pair of the input unlike contrastive learning methods [36] [37] that compares among the batch inputs. Therefore, we extended BYOL for audio application.

The following summarizes our contributions:

- We propose Bootstrap Your Own Latent (BYOL) for Audio (BYOL-A, pronounced “viola”). BYOL-A learns representations robust to the perturbations of sounds.
- We also propose to combine statistics of frequency- and channel-wise, local, and global features in the global pooling operation in the BYOL-A encoder to provide multiple aspects of information.
- We validate our hypotheses in experiments: Comparison with the conventional state-of-the-art models shows that BYOL-A outperforms them on some tasks and provides the best average performance. Extensive ablation experiments clarify the contributions of BYOL-A components.
- We make our evaluations comparable with a wide variety of eleven representations from eight public audio pre-trained models and tasks under a unified test setting to clarify their effectiveness.

Fig. [1] describes BYOL-A representation learning scenario and the encoder components. BYOL-A pre-trains the encoder to transform the input to representations robust to data augmentations, and the global pooling in the encoder combines multiple aspects of features. As a result, representations should become robust and multi-aspect for serving various needs of audio task settings.

II. RELATED WORK

A. Relationship with our previous work

We introduced BYOL-A in our previous work [38]. In this section, we clarify the relationship between the previous and present work.

Our previous work proposed BYOL-A, which extends BYOL to work with audio data augmentations designed to learn the audio representations of specific targets, namely foreground acoustic event sound and the sound texture details. Though it showed the state-of-the-art performance by learning representations for these targets, the comparisons were limited only among unsupervised learning methods, and we did not discuss encoder architecture improvements.

In this paper, we redefined our hypothesis to explore pre-trained general-purpose audio representations with a broader research scope. To achieve this new goal, we extended BYOL-A to learn representations invariant to the perturbations of sound. We also extended the BYOL-A encoder architecture to provide multiple aspects of learned features. Ablation studies in Section IV-C and IV-D clarify the improvements from the previous one proposed in [38].

Detailed differences are listed as follows:

- We redefine our hypothesis for effective general-purpose audio representations.
- We reinterpret and redefine BYOL-A to learn representations invariant to the perturbations of sounds made by data augmentations rather than learn representations of specific target sounds.
- We refine audio data augmentations for improving performance.
- We also improve the encoder architecture to make representations that provide multiple aspects of information such as local and global features.
- We evaluate our proposals with a wide variety of popular models and tasks under a unified test setting to clarify their effectiveness.

B. Audio pre-training methods

This section provides an overview of previous audio pre-training studies potentially or explicitly available in general-purpose tasks.

Many supervised learning models pre-trained on large-scale datasets have been proposed mainly for SER tasks. VGGish [5] pre-trained on YouTube-8M [39] is used as a feature extractor in various application studies [8] [9] [10] [40] [41]. Pre-Trained Audio Neural Networks (PANNs) [12] models pre-trained on AudioSet [22] showed state-of-the-art results, and they have been used in application studies [6] [41]. Pre-training on both ImageNet and AudioSet shows advantages: PSLA [13].
ESResNe(X)t-fbsp \cite{14}, and Audio Spectrogram Transformer (AST) \cite{15} produced state-of-the-art results on SER.

For unsupervised learning, self-supervised learning (SSL) methods have been proposed such as COLA \cite{20} for general-purpose representations and Fonseca et al. \cite{21} for SER. SSL models are specifically proposed for speech representations, including Wav2Vec 2.0 \cite{42}, PACE+ \cite{43}, and TRILL \cite{19}. In particular, Wav2Vec 2.0 was fine-tuned on the automatic speech recognition (ASR) task and provided state-of-the-art performance, and it has also been used in non-ASR application studies \cite{7}.

Cross-modal/multi-modal pre-training methods have been proposed: OpenL3 \cite{17} was pre-trained by using audio-visual correspondence as training signal. Wang et al. \cite{18} was pre-trained by using correspondence between video, spectrograms, and raw waveforms to learn general-purpose audio representations. COALA \cite{16} was pre-trained by aligning the learned latent representations of audio and associated tags and evaluated on SER and music tasks. These studies showed effectiveness, but their evaluation settings are not compatible with each other, making comparison difficult for reasonable choice by the future applications.

C. Global pooling design choices

Previous studies have taken various global pooling approaches: VGGish \cite{5}, OpenL3 \cite{17}, and COALA \cite{16} flatten frequency bins, time frames, and channels into a single embedding vector. COLA \cite{20}, TRILL \cite{19}, ESResNe(X)t-fbsp \cite{14}, and Fonseca et al. \cite{21} use the global average or max pooling commonly used in image CNNs. Other approaches average frequency first and then summarize time. PANNs’ \cite{12} CNN14 model first averages the frequency\(^{(2)}\) and applies a temporal pooling, which we refer to as temporal mean+max pooling hereafter. It first applies both temporal mean- and max-pooling in parallel, then sums both embeddings as the output embedding. Fonseca et al. \cite{35} also used frequency average pooling first and then applied temporal max pooling. Ford et al. \cite{44} proposed to add an attention module for summarizing the output of frequency average pooling.

All these approaches apply flattening, max, or averaging operation, which can hurt the information needed for downstream tasks. For example, averaging along frequency hides information about frequency patterns that can be crucial to tasks such as speaker age estimation.

D. Bootstrap Your Own Latent (BYOL)

BYOL \cite{11}, is a self-supervised learning algorithm that learns image representations invariant to data augmentations. Although contrastive learning methods such as SimCLR \cite{36} and MoCo \cite{37} also learn representations invariant to data augmentations as BYOL does, we believe that BYOL is appropriate for our purpose because it learns representations from a single input, whereas contrastive learning methods learn by comparison among input batch samples.

As shown in Fig. 2, BYOL consists of two neural networks, referred to as online and target networks. The online network is defined by a set of weights \(\theta\), and the target network has the same architecture as the online network but uses a different set of weights, \(\xi\). First, BYOL produces two augmented views, \(v \equiv t(x)\) and \(v' \equiv t'(x)\), from an image \(x\) by applying respectively image augmentations \(t \sim \mathcal{T}\) and \(t' \sim \mathcal{T}'\), where \(\mathcal{T}\) and \(\mathcal{T}'\) denote the two distributions of the image augmentations. Then, the online network outputs a representation \(v_\theta\), a projection \(z_\theta\), and a prediction \(v'_\theta\) from the first view \(v\). On the other hand, the target network outputs \(v'_\xi\) and the target projection \(z'_\xi\) from the second view \(v'\). Finally, the following mean squared error between the L2-normalized predictions \(\widehat{v}_\theta(z_\theta)\) and target projections \(z'_\xi\) is calculated:

\[
L_{\theta,\xi} \equiv ||\widehat{v}_\theta(z_\theta) - z'_\xi||_2^2 = 2 - 2 \cdot \frac{\langle v_\theta(z_\theta), z'_\xi \rangle}{||v_\theta(z_\theta)||_2 \cdot ||z'_\xi||_2},
\]

where \(\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle\) denotes the inner product. To symmetrize the loss \(L_{\theta,\xi}\), \(L_{\theta,\xi}'\) is computed by feeding \(v'\) to the online network and \(v\) to the target network. The final loss is defined as \(L_{\theta,\xi}^{BYOL} = L_{\theta,\xi} + L_{\theta,\xi}'\). At each training step, BYOL minimizes this loss function with respect to \(\theta\) only, but \(\xi\) is a slowly moving exponential average of \(\theta\): \(\xi \leftarrow \tau \xi + (1 - \tau)\theta\), where \(\tau\) is a target decay rate.

It has been empirically shown that the combination of the predictor to the online network and using the moving average of the online network parameters as the target network encourages encoding more and more information within the online projection and avoids collapsed solutions such as constant representations.

E. Relationship with audio self-supervised learning methods learning from comparisons

Related methods such as TRILL \cite{19}, COLA \cite{20}, and Fonseca et al. \cite{21} learn representations by comparing input segments cropped from audio clips. These learn to make closer embeddings for segments closer in time, while pushing away embeddings for remote segments. Though different segments could have different details, these encourage representations to become closer for the closer segments, even ignoring the details. In contrast, we propose to learn representations of the audio segment itself with details.

III. PROPOSED METHODS

A. BYOL for Audio (BYOL-A)

We expand BYOL, named BYOL for Audio, to learn representations of the input itself invariant to the perturbations of sounds by replacing data augmentations for audio, as shown in Fig. 2.

As shown in Fig. 3, the BYOL-A augmentation module is composed of pre- and post-normalization blocks and three augmentation blocks: Mixup \cite{45} (Section III-A1), Random Resize Crop (RRC, Section III-A2), and Random Linear Fader (RLF, Section III-A3). Mixup makes random background sound, RRC makes random frequency/time shift/stretch, and
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Fig. 2. Original BYOL and BYOL for Audio system overview.
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Fig. 3. Audio augmentation module of BYOL-A. (a) Block diagram. (b) Simplified example of outputs.

Fig. 4. Example of augmentation results. BYOL-A learns to cancel the difference between \( v \) and \( v' \). Each block result of the \( v' \) is shown at the bottom.

RLF makes random temporal amplitude change, a simulation of random fade in/out.

Fig. 4 shows an example of augmentations. BYOL-A learns to cancel the difference between two augmentation results \( v \) and \( v' \). As a result, the learned representations should be robust to the perturbation of sounds (e.g., robust to changes in background sound, pitch shift, time shift and stretch, and volume of sound).

The input raw audio samples are preprocessed into time-frequency (TF) features of the log-mel spectrogram, as has been done in previous studies. Then the module applies Pre-Norm, which normalizes input data \( x \) to \( \tilde{x} = (x - \mu) / \sigma \), where \( \mu \) and \( \sigma \) are the average and standard deviation of training samples, respectively. This operation stabilizes the computations in the following augmentations blocks. Similarly, after all the augmentations are applied, the module also applies Post-Norm, so that the final outputs of the augmentation module become \( \sim N(0, 1) \). Augmentation operations can cause statistical drift in their outputs; the Post-norm corrects this possible drift.

As we describe in Section III-A4, we design the encoder for BYOL-A to encode representations to form multiple aspects of information by combining statistics of frequency- and channel-wise, local, and global features. As a result, representations should serve to meet various needs of tasks.

1) Mixup for making background sound perturbation: We modify Mixup [45] or between-class (BC) learning [46] to make slight randomness in background sound. These data augmentation techniques interpolate both features and labels between two data samples to create new data. Using normalized log-mel spectrogram audio as input, our Mixup block randomly picks up a sample from a queue of past inputs and mixes it with the current input audio sample in a small ratio. As a result, mixed random audio becomes a part of the background sound in the current input.

While the original Mixup applies to both audio features and labels, our Mixup applies only to the features because we do not use labels. In addition, as audio is log-scaled, we convert the input to a linear scale before the Mixup calculation and restore it to a log-scale again. In this paper, we refer to these operations as log-mixup-exp, from the analogy to the log-sum-exp [47] calculation. Log-mixup-exp of \( i \)th input \( x_i \) is

\[
\tilde{x}_i = \log \left( (1 - \lambda) \exp(x_i) + \lambda \exp(x_k) \right)
\]

where \( x_k \) is a mixing counterpart, and mixing ratio \( \lambda \) is sampled from the uniform distribution \( U(0, 0, \alpha) \), like in between-class learning. In addition, \( \alpha \) is a mixing ratio hyper-parameter that controls the degree of contrast between the resulting two mixed outputs. We observed that the evaluation result improves with smaller \( \alpha \), 0.2 for example, where \( \tilde{x}_i \) retains more of the original contents \( x_i \) than its counterpart \( x_k \) does, as we found in preliminary experiments.
where $T$ is the number of time frames, start frame gain $a \sim U(-1.0, 1.0)$, and end frame gain $b \sim U(-1.0, 1.0)$. The $S[t]$ is the gain for each time frame linearly interpolated from $a$ to $b$. Then, we add $S$ to the input to make a linear amplitude change in log-mel spectrogram.

$$x'[t, f] = x[t, f] + S[t],$$

for $f \in \{0, \ldots, F - 1\}$,

for $t \in \{0, \ldots, T - 1\}$

where $x'[t, f]$ is the result of RLF calculation, and $F$ is the number of frequency bins, respectively. For example, if $a = -1$ and $b = 0.5$, the relationship is $a < b$, which is an approximation of fade-in where the volume increases with time; if $a = 0.5$ and $b = -0.5$, it is an approximation of fade-out where the volume decreases with time.

4) **BYOL-A encoder architecture**: In our design, the BYOL-A encoder provides multiple aspects of information by (i) flattening learned features without loss, (ii) combining local and global features, and (iii) combining average and maximum statistics in time.

We use the audio embedding block from [48] that satisfies our requirement (i) as a base of our encoder. We make the following modifications: Concatenation of local and global features to enable (ii), addition of temporal mean+max pooling to enable (iii), and adjustment of the local feature size for performance improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Output size</th>
<th>Operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Input</td>
<td>[B, 1, 64, 96]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conv1</td>
<td>[B, 64, 32, 48]</td>
<td>Conv2d 3x3 @ 64 BatchNorm2d @ 64 ReLU MaxPool2d 2x2, stride=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conv2</td>
<td>[B, 64, 16, 24]</td>
<td>Conv2d 3x3 @ 64 BatchNorm2d @ 64 ReLU MaxPool2d 2x2, stride=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLP</td>
<td>[B, 24, 2048]</td>
<td>FC 2048 ReLU Dropout p=0.3 FC 2048 ReLU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concat</td>
<td>[B, 24, 3072]</td>
<td>Concatenate outputs from Reshaping and MLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooling</td>
<td>[B, 3072]</td>
<td>Temporal mean+max pooling [12]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I shows the architecture, where 3x3 or 2x2 denotes the filter size, and the number after @ indicates the channel size, respectively. First, Conv1/2 convolve the input to summarize
local features. Then, the Reshaping block flattens the frequency and channel along the time axis to implement (i). The MLP learns to transform the relationship in the local features as the global features. Then the Concat block concatenates the outputs from the Reshaping and MLP, fusing local and global features, implementing (ii). Finally, the Pooling operation, temporal mean+max pooling, summarizes representations in time frames into 3,072 dimensional embeddings, implementing (iii).

The first modification adds the Concat block that concatenates features from the earlier Reshaping block, a local feature, and later MLP block, a global feature.

The second modification adds the Pooling block that sums each element from temporal mean pooling and temporal max pooling of Concat output features, the temporal mean+max pooling [12], to accommodate advantages of both average and maximum statistics.

The last modification, adjusting the local feature size, reduces the number of convolutional blocks. We handle the local feature size as the receptive field (RF) size, and it is crucial to tune the RF of CNNs for their generalization to unseen testing data, according to Koutini et al. [49]. Changing the number of blocks adjusts the RF size; one block halves the output in frequency and time axes, inversely doubling the RF size. Then we found in a prior exploratory experiment that the best number of blocks is two, reduced from three. We discuss more of the necessity of RF size adjustment in Appendix A.

The encoder with these modifications, as a whole, make representations from the earlier Reshaping block, a local feature, and later MLP block, a global feature.
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output 128-d per frame embeddings used by [8] [9] [10] [40] [41], and [S] VGGish-4K is the 4,096-d per frame embeddings from the first FC block. We use pre-trained weights from a public repository.

- [Sas] PANNs is the CNN14 from PANNs [12] pre-trained on AudioSet. We use 2,048-d embeddings that are the input to the last FC layer, and use pre-trained weights from a public repository.

- [Sas] ESResNe(X)t-fbsp [13] (ESResNeXt) is a CNN pre-trained on ImageNet and AudioSet. We extract 2,048-d embeddings that are the input to the last FC layer, and use the weights from a public repository.

- [Sas] AST [15] is an Audio Spectrogram Transformer pre-trained on ImageNet and AudioSet. We use 768-d [CLS] token embeddings, and the weights from a public repository.

- [Ux] COALA [16] is a cross-modal self-supervised learning of audio and tags, pre-trained on a smaller dataset consisting of 170,793 training and 19,103 validation sounds from Freesound [52]. We use the audio encoder output, 1,152-d per frame embeddings, and pre-trained weights from a public repository.

- [Ux] OpenL3-E and [Ux] OpenL3-M are from OpenL3 [17], cross-modal self-supervised learning of audio and video that pre-trains the $L^3$-Net [53] models on the environmental or music subset of AudioSet. We use 6,144-d per frame embeddings outputs from $L^3$-Nets audio encoders and pre-trained weights from a public repository.

- [U] TRILL [19] is a speech representation model pre-trained on speech containing clips from AudioSet. We use layer19 12,288-d embeddings and pre-trained weights on the TensorFlow Hub.

- [U] Wav2Vec2-F and [U] Wav2Vec2-C are from Wav2Vec2.0 [20]. [U] Wav2Vec2-F is the 512-d embeddings from the front-end CNN feature encoder, and [U] Wav2Vec2-C is the 1,024-d embeddings from the Transformer former context network output. We use the Wav2Vec2-Large-960h-Lv60 pre-trained weights on the Hugging Face model hub [10] pre-trained on Librispeech [54]. Since the Wav2Vec2.0 is pre-trained on the ASR corpus only, downstream tasks other than speech context are challenging.

2) Downstream tasks: We employed ten downstream tasks widely used in the previous studies as shown in Table III: three sound event recognition (SER) tasks, four non-semantic speech (NOSS) tasks, and three music tasks. All tasks are multi-class single-label classifications except FSD50K, which is a multi-label classification. Therefore, we report FSD50K results separately. The following describes the tasks:

- **ESC-50 [23]:** a sound classification with 50 environmental sound classes. We conduct leave-one-out cross-validation (LOOCV) with the official five folds.
- **UrbanSound8K [24] (US8K):** a sound classification with ten urban sound classes. We conduct LOOCV with the official ten folds.
- **FSD50K [25]:** a multi-label classification SER task with 200 classes drawn from AudioSet ontology that covers a wide variety of sound events.
- **Speech Commands V2 [26] (SPCV2):** a speech command word classification task, containing 105,829 utterances from 2,618 speakers.
- **VoxCeleb1 [27] (VC1):** a dataset consisting of interview videos of celebrities. We use this as a speaker identification task of audio samples.
- **VoxForge [26] (VF):** a large collection of musical notes. We use this as an instrument family classification task.
- **GTZAN [28]:** a music genre recognition task with ten music genre classes. We follow fault-filtered partitioning.
- **CREMA-D [57] (CRM-D):** a dataset consisting of facial and vocal emotional expressions. We use audio data as a speech emotion recognition (SER) task of six classes. We assign 70 % of speakers (63) as training, 10 % (9) as validation, and the remaining 20 % (19) as test splits, with no speaker duplication in multiple splits.
- **NSynth [29]:** a large collection of musical notes. We use this as an instrument family classification task.

### TABLE III

**Downstream task details.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SER tasks</th>
<th>NOSS tasks</th>
<th>Music tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESC-50</td>
<td>US8K</td>
<td>FSD50K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of training samples</td>
<td>5 folds</td>
<td>10 folds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of validation samples</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>8,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of classes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average duration</td>
<td>5.0 s</td>
<td>4.0 s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous studies</th>
<th>Using tasks</th>
<th># of validation samples</th>
<th># of training samples</th>
<th>Average duration</th>
<th># of classes</th>
<th># of classes</th>
<th># of classes</th>
<th># of classes</th>
<th># of classes</th>
<th># of classes</th>
<th># of classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surge [55]</td>
<td>using tasks</td>
<td>4,170</td>
<td>9,901</td>
<td>6,904</td>
<td>26,684</td>
<td>1,152</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Surge [55] is a new dataset that evaluates itself using COALA [16] and OpenL3 [17].

https://tfhub.dev/google/nonsemantic-speech-benchmark/trill/2
https://github.com/torchopenl3/torchopenl3
https://github.com/xavierfav/coala
https://github.com/AndreyGuzhov/ESResNeXt-fbsp
https://github.com/YuanGongND/ast
https://github.com/tcvrick/audioset-vggish-tensorflow-to-pytorch
• Pitch Audio Dataset (Surge synthesizer) [55] (Surge): a pitch audio classification task composed of 88 MIDI note classes and 2,084 tone preset sounds. We assign 10% of the presets as validation, another 10% as test, and the remaining 80% as a training set.

3) FSD50K extension: Sound event characteristics subsets: In addition to the perspective of diverse tasks, we added a view of the sound event characteristics to gain an understanding of the utility of representations. To do so, we introduced three subsets of FSD50K classes that group together the original classes that have similar characteristics of the sound events they contain. We report mAP results for each subset as well as the usual mAP results for all classes. The following lists the subsets; Appendix [B] describes the details:

• Single-source event: Class of a single sound source regardless of its repetition or continuation. Examples: 'Accordion', 'Bark', 'Bicycle bell', 'Boom', 'Clapping', 'Cough', 'Glass', 'Knock', 'Stream', 'Wind'.

• Sequential event: Class of a specific sequential sound occurrence of a sound source, characterized by the sequential change in pitch, amplitude, and/or timbre. Examples: 'Car passing by', 'Fill (with liquid)', 'Hammer', 'Idling', 'Laughter', 'Ocean', 'Pour', 'Run', 'Sliding door', 'Tick-tock'.

• Scene event: Class of a group of multiple sound sources that describe a scene. Included classes are: 'Applause' 'Cheering', 'Crowd', 'Drum kit', 'Race car, auto racing', 'Subway, metro, underground'.

B. Benchmarking BYOL-A

We pre-train and evaluate BYOL-A in this section.

1) BYOL-A pre-training details: Projection and prediction in BYOL-A networks are the same MLPs in the original BYOL, i.e., a linear layer with output size of 4,096 followed by batch normalization (BatchNorm), rectified linear units (ReLU), and a linear layer to output embeddings with 256 dimensions. We used the Adam optimizer with a learning rate of 0.0001, target decay rate parameter $\tau = 0.99$, and batch size of 256, and it was trained for 100 epochs.

For augmentation blocks, we used Mixup $\alpha = 0.2$. The size of the virtual crop boundary has the number of time frames to 1.5 times the input and the number of frequency bins to the same as the input. The crop range was $[0,1.5]$ for both frequency bins and time frames. All these values were found in a preliminary parameter search using Optuna [60]. We used a single set of augmentation $T$, i.e., $t, t' \sim T$.

We pre-trained using the 1,963,807 samples from balanced_train_segments and unbalanced_train_segments data splits of the AudioSet [22] without labels.

In the ablation studies, we pre-trained using a development set of FSD50K [23] without labels, 40,966 samples in total, with increased training epochs of 500.

2) BYOL-A evaluation results and discussion: As shown in Table IV, BYOL-A outperforms other models with state-of-the-art results on VoxCeleb1 and CREMA-D tasks, especially on VoxCeleb1, which shows 57.6% with a large margin from other models. Moreover, BYOL-A provides the best average result of 72.4%.

However, in the ESC-50, US8K, and GTZAN, BYOL-A has a performance gap compared to the AudioSet-supervised learning models. We think that AudioSet class supervision can cover similar class labels in these tasks. For the SPCV2 and VoxForge tasks, Wav2Vec2-C shows the best performance, suggesting that pre-training specialized for speech has advantages in spoken language tasks, while BYOL-A shows closer performance compared to other models.

Unsupervised learning models generally perform well in all tasks, suggesting that they effectively acquire general-purpose representations. While TRILL and Wav2Vec2-C, pre-trained only on speech data, do not perform well in tasks other than speech, OpenL3-M, pre-trained on music samples, and OpenL3-E, pre-trained on environmental sounds, showed stable and good performance in tasks beyond the training data domain.

### Table IV

Linear evaluation benchmark accuracies (%) with 95% confidence intervals (CI) of audio representations on downstream tasks. BYOL-A is pre-trained on AudioSet. Top: reference results, middle & bottom: results of this evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>SER tasks</th>
<th>NOSS tasks</th>
<th>Music tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESC-50</td>
<td>US8K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[U] TRILL [19]</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[U] COLA [20]</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ux] Wang et al. [18]</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[S] VGGish [5]</td>
<td>68.2 ± 11</td>
<td>75.1 ± 0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[S] VGGish-K [5]</td>
<td>79.5 ± 0.4</td>
<td>78.5 ± 0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Sas] PANNs [32]</td>
<td>90.1 ± 0.4</td>
<td>82.0 ± 0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Sas] ESResNeXt [14]</td>
<td>89.0 ± 12</td>
<td>84.3 ± 0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Sas] AST [15]</td>
<td>93.5 ± 0.4</td>
<td>85.5 ± 0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[U] COALX [16]</td>
<td>74.7 ± 13</td>
<td>71.9 ± 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[U] OpenL3-E [17]</td>
<td>81.2 ± 13</td>
<td>80.7 ± 0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[U] OpenL3-M [17]</td>
<td>82.2 ± 08</td>
<td>80.4 ± 0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[U] TRILL [19]</td>
<td>75.4 ± 07</td>
<td>75.2 ± 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[U] Wav2Vec2-C [12]</td>
<td>65.6 ± 17</td>
<td>67.8 ± 0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[U] Wav2Vec2-C [12]</td>
<td>59.3 ± 04</td>
<td>64.7 ± 06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[U] BYOL-A</td>
<td>83.2 ± 06</td>
<td>79.7 ± 05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reference result of intra-speaker task, trained and tested on one speaker at a time, then results averaged across speakers.
C. Ablations of BYOL-A augmentation blocks

This experiment evaluates various combinations of audio augmentation blocks.

1) Experimental setting details: We tried combinations of Mixup, RRC, RLF, and an extra block, Gaussian-noise (Gaussian), which interpolates training input with random data points sampled from the normal distribution. We added the Gaussian for comparison with Mixup that interpolates within-dataset samples. The Gaussian block samples random data points from $\sim N(0, 0.4)$, the best parameter in a preliminary test, and follows the log-mixup-exp calculation described in Section III-A1.

2) Experimental results: Table VI shows that combining augmentations improves average performance more than using them independently, and the (a) Mixup+RRC+RLF, which is BYOL-A, shows the best performance. If we focus on each result, (f) RRC is the most effective compared to (g) Mixup and (h) RLF, and (d) combining RLF with RRC gets closer to $-0.86$ from (a), and (e) combining Mixup with RRC gets even closer, to $-0.03$ from (a). These results indicate that the perturbations created by each Mixup, RRC, and RLF work effectively to improve the performance of learned representations.

The BYOL-A in our previous work [38] is (e) RRC+Mixup, which we improved to (a) with the performance difference of 0.03.

3) Discussion about contribution of the Mixup: Comparison between (a), (b), and (c) shows that Mixup, interpolating within-dataset samples, is more effective than Gaussian interpolating with random samples. The result of (a) Mixup+RRC+RLF, which is BYOL-A, is superior to that of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Augmentation blocks used</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Mixup+RRC+RLF (BYOL-A)</td>
<td><strong>70.32</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Mixup+Gaussian+RRC+RLF</td>
<td>70.12</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Gaussian+RRC+RLF</td>
<td>69.22</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) RRC+RLF</td>
<td>69.46</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) RRC+Mixup</td>
<td>70.30</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) RRC</td>
<td>68.68</td>
<td>-1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Mixup</td>
<td>62.47</td>
<td>-7.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) RLF</td>
<td>57.70</td>
<td>-12.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table VI
ACURACIES (%) OF BYOL-A AUGMENTATION BLOCK ABLATIONS, PRE-TRAINED ON FSD50K.
(b) and (c), where (b) adds Gaussian on top of (a), and (c) replaces Mixup in (a) with Gaussian. In other words, mixing random noise cannot be as effective as mixing the sounds from the dataset for making background sound perturbations.

### D. Ablations of BYOL-A encoder global pooling blocks

We conducted an ablation study of the global pooling blocks in the BYOL-A encoder. We observed the impact on performance of Reshaping, MLP, Concat, and Pooling blocks. As for the Reshaping, we replaced it with frequency or channel pooling. Table [IV-C3] shows the configurations, and table [IV-C5] shows the corresponding results.

Comparing the case of (1) Reshaping with (2) Frequency mean pooling and (3) Channel mean pooling, the average performance of both (2) and (3) deteriorates significantly by −7.1 and −9.8, respectively. Focusing on each result, the performance of (2) Frequency mean pooling deteriorates on SPCV2, VC1, and Surge, indicating that the handling of frequency-wise information is crucial for these tasks. (3) Channel mean pooling shows a significant deterioration in overall performance, indicating that averaging significantly impairs the information stored in the Channel.

Comparing (4) global feature (MLP) only and (5) local feature (Reshaping) only against the (1) combination of both, the performance of (4) global feature is better than (5) local feature in most tasks. And the (1) combination of both features works effectively to improve the performance on average, especially on the VoxCeleb1.

Comparing the results when the temporal pooling method is changed from (1) mean+max to (6) mean and (7) max, respectively, shows that it depends on the task for which (6) mean or (7) max is effective. When combined as (1) mean+max, they work complementarily, and the performance on VoxCeleb1 improves more. These results support the design choice of PANNs [12], which introduced the temporal mean+max pooling.

The BYOL-A in our previous work [38] is (4) global feature only, which we improved to (1) with the performance difference of 2.0.

### V. Conclusion

In this study, we explored pre-trained audio representations for general audio tasks. We hypothesized that representations effective for general audio tasks should provide multiple aspects of robust features of the input sound. Features should be robust to the sound perturbations such as varying pitch or timbre, and representations should provide multiple aspects of features, such as local and global features and their statistics. As a result, these representations should serve to meet the diverse needs of tasks.

We proposed a self-supervised learning method Bootstrap Your Own Latent (BYOL) for Audio (BYOL-A, pronounced “viola”), to pre-train audio representations invariant to the slight perturbations of background sound, frequency/time shift/stretch, and temporal amplitude change. For making representations to provide multiple aspects of features, we made the global pooling in the BYOL-A encoder to combine

### TABLE VII

**Configurations of BYOL-A encoder global pooling ablations. Reshaping output is the size of (C)hannel and (F)requency along with (T)ime frame.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Reshaping output</th>
<th>MLP block</th>
<th>Concat block</th>
<th>Temporal pooling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) (Base) BYOL-A</td>
<td>[T, C, F]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>mean+max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Frequency mean pooling</td>
<td>[T, C]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>mean+max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Channel mean pooling</td>
<td>[T, C]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>mean+max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Use global feature (MLP)</td>
<td>[T, C, F]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>mean+max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Use local feature (Reshaping)</td>
<td>[T, C, F]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>mean+max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Temporal mean pooling</td>
<td>[T, C, F]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>mean+max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Temporal max pooling</td>
<td>[T, C, F]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>max</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE VIII

**ACCURACIES (%) OF BYOL-A ENCODER GLOBAL POOLING ABLATIONS PRE-TRAINED ON FSD50K, SUB-CATEGORIZED BY CONDITIONS: (2,3) FREQ./CH. POOLING, (4,5) GLOBAL/LOCAL FEATURES, AND (6,7) TEMPORAL POOLING. UNDERLINE HIGHER RESULTS IN THE SUB CATEGORY.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>SER tasks ESC-50</th>
<th>SER tasks US8K</th>
<th>NOSS tasks SPCV2</th>
<th>NOSS tasks VC1</th>
<th>NOSS tasks VF</th>
<th>NOSS tasks CRM-D</th>
<th>Music tasks GTZAN</th>
<th>Music tasks NSynth</th>
<th>Music tasks Surge</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) (Base) BYOL-A</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Freq. mean pooling</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>-7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Channel mean pooling</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>-9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Use global feature only</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Use local feature only</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Temporal mean pooling</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Temporal max pooling</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We evaluated the general-purpose task performance among previous state-of-the-art methods on ten SER, NOSS, and music tasks. The evaluation showed that BYOL-A representation is effective for general-purpose with competitive results in all tasks and the best average result of 72.4%. It also set new records of 57.6% on VoxCeleb1 and 63.8% on CREMA-D.

In addition, extensive ablation studies confirmed that the BYOL-A components work together to make representations effective in all tasks, validating that BYOL-A representation—multiple aspects of robust features of the input sound—is effective for general-purpose tasks.

A limitation of BYOL-A may be the dependence on the data augmentation methods and their hyper-parameters. BYOL-A learns from the inductive bias of augmentations that we designed based on our hypothesis derived from the observation of task setting. Further explorations of approaches to automated design of augmentations would be an interesting future direction.

Our code is available online. We hope that it fosters progress in future studies of audio representations.

# Appendix A

## Making an Image-CNN-Based Model Perform on General Audio Task Benchmark

To further elaborate on our encoder design described in Section III-A4, we discuss what makes a CNN model perform well on our benchmark using image-CNN-based architecture as an example. We use 18-layer ResNet [3] from image-CNNs, and we change its input channels from three to one, and remove the FC layer. Then the modified version, named ResNet-like, accepts batch input with a shape \([B, 1, \text{Frequency}, \text{Time frame}]\), and outputs \([B, 512], 512\)-d embeddings.

We made two improved versions based on the ResNet-like. One is ‘ResNet-like (ReGP)’, where a ResNet-like replaces global pooling (Replacement of Global Pooling; ReGP). The other is ‘ResNet-like (ReGP + Narrow RF)’, which is a ResNet-like (ReGP) with a modification so that the receptive field (RF) becomes narrower.

ResNet-like has a global average pooling that averages frequency and time axes and outputs 512-d embeddings. ResNet-like (ReGP) replaces the global average pooling with the Reshaping and Pooling blocks from the BYOL-A encoder, making output as 1,024-d embeddings.

ResNet-like (ReGP + Narrow RF) adjusts RF by changing stride=2 parameter on the first two stride=2 layers in convolutional blocks to stride=1, making the stride of frequency to be 1. This modification will make the RF smaller on the frequency axis. With an input shape \([64, 96]\), where [Frequency, Time frame], the output shape is \([2, 3]\), which becomes \([8, 3]\) after the modification. This changes the frequency resolution from two to eight, accommodating more frequency information available on downstream tasks. This makes a larger embedding size: 512 channel \(\times 8\) frequency bins \(= 4,096\)-d.

We pre-trained these models in BYOL-A by replacing the encoder with them, using the same setting as in the BYOL-A ablation studies described in Section IV-B1.

Table IX shows the results of the ResNet-like variants. The base model’s performance, ResNet-like, is 61.4%, and it improves with ResNet-like (ReGP) to 63.3%. The performance of ResNet-like (ReGP + Narrow RF) improves to 69.2%, which is comparable to BYOL-A’s, 70.3%.

These results show that global pooling in the image-CNN-based architecture needs to be improved, as discussed in Section II-C. Moreover, adjusting frequency resolution is also crucial for good performance in general audio tasks, as reported in a previous study [29].

## Appendix B

### FSD50K Sound Event Characteristics Subsets Detail

This appendix describes assigning FSD50K classes to the three sound event characteristic subsets defined in Section IV-A3. We conducted the following steps to examine all FSD50K classes and determined the assignment. First, we randomly select 50 samples from the target class. Then, we conducted a manual inspection by listening to each sample to determine which subset the sample belongs to. After inspecting all 50 samples, only if 80% (40 samples) or more fall into one subset, we assigned the target class to the subset. We excluded classes that fell into multiple subsets (e.g., the Liquid class falls into a single-source and sequential event) and classes with vague characteristics (e.g., Mechanisms, Wood, etc.) from the assignment. We repeated these steps and finally assigned 93 classes to one of the subsets out of 200 classes.

Table X lists the FSD50K classes assigned to the sound event characteristics subsets.
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