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Abstract—Deep learning based speech enhancement in the short-term Fourier transform (STFT) domain typically uses a large window length such as 32 ms. A larger window contains more samples and the frequency resolution can be higher for potentially better enhancement. This however incurs an algorithmic latency of 32 ms in an online setup, because the overlap-add algorithm used in the inverse STFT (iSTFT) is also performed based on the same 32 ms window size. To reduce this inherent latency, we adapt a conventional dual window size approach, where a regular input window size is used for STFT but a shorter output window is used for the overlap-add in the iSTFT, for STFT-domain deep learning based frame-online speech enhancement. Based on this STFT and iSTFT configuration, we employ single- or multi-microphone complex spectral mapping for frame-online enhancement, where a deep neural network (DNN) is trained to predict the real and imaginary (RI) components of target speech from the mixture RI components. In addition, we use the RI components predicted by the DNN to conduct frame-online beamforming, the results of which are then used as extra features for a second DNN to perform frame-online post-filtering. The frequency-domain beamforming in between the two DNNs can be easily integrated with complex spectral mapping and is designed to not incur any algorithmic latency. Additionally, we propose a future-frame prediction technique to further reduce the algorithmic latency. Evaluation results on a noisy-reverberant speech enhancement task demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed algorithms. Compared with Conv-TasNet, our STFT-domain system can achieve better enhancement performance for a comparable amount of computation, or comparable performance with less computation, maintaining strong performance at an algorithmic latency as low as 2 ms.

Index Terms—Frame-online speech enhancement, complex spectral mapping, microphone array processing, deep learning.

I. INTRODUCTION

Deep learning has dramatically advanced speech enhancement in the past decade [1]. Early studies estimated target magnitudes via time-frequency (T-F) masking [2] or directly predicted target magnitude via spectral mapping [3], both using the mixture phase for signal re-synthesis. Subsequent studies strove to improve phase modelling by performing phase estimation via magnitude-driven iterative phase reconstruction [4]. Recent effort focuses on complex- and time-domain approaches [5]–[11], where magnitude and phase are modelled simultaneously through end-to-end optimization.

Many application scenarios such as teleconferencing and hearing aids require low-latency speech enhancement. Deep learning based approaches [8], [12]–[16] handle this by using causal DNN blocks, such as uni-directional LSTMs, causal convolutions, causal attention layers, and causal normalization layers. Although many previous studies along this line advocate that their system with a causal DNN model is causal, one should be aware that most of these systems are, to be more precise, frame-online, and the amount of look-ahead depends on the frame length. One major approach that can potentially achieve sample-level causal processing is by using WaveNet-like models [17]. However, their effectiveness in dealing with noise and reverberation in a sample-causal setup is unclear [18]. In addition, at run time such models need to run a forward pass for each sample, resulting in a humongous and likely unnecessary amount of computation. Popular STFT- and time-domain approaches typically split signals into overlapped frames with a reasonably large hop length before processing. One advantage is that the forward pass then only needs to be run every hop-length samples. The latency is however equal to the window length due to the use of overlap-add in signal re-synthesis, plus the running time of processing one frame (see Fig. 1 and its caption for a detailed explanation of the latency). In the recent Deep Noise Suppression (DNS) challenge [19], one key requirement was that the latency of producing an estimate for the sample at index $n$ cannot exceed 40 ms on a standard Intel Core i5 processor. For a typical STFT based system with a 32 ms window and an 8 ms hop size, a frame-online DNN based system satisfies the requirement if the processing of each frame can finish within 8 ms on the specified processor. We define the latency due to algorithmic reasons (such as overlap-add) as algorithmic latency, and the computing time needed to process one frame as hardware latency. The overall latency is the summation of the two and is denoted as processing latency.

Although a 40 ms processing latency can meet the demand of many applications, for hearing aids this latency is too large to deliver a good listening experience. In the recent Clarity challenge, proposed for hearing aid design [20], the required algorithmic latency was 5 ms. Such a low-latency constraint requires new designs and significant modifications to existing enhancement algorithms. To meet this constraint, our study aims at an enhancement system with a window that looks ahead at most 4 ms of samples, and a 2 ms hop size. We assume that the hardware latency can be within 2 ms, leading to a maximum processing delay of 6 ms, even though this computational capability might not be available right now for a computationally demanding DNN model on resource-constrained edge devices. We emphasize that this study focuses on improving enhancement performance and reducing
algorithmic latency rather than computational efficiency or feasibility on current hardware.

In the literature, some STFT-domain beamforming studies [21], [22] use small window and hop sizes to achieve enhancement with a low algorithmic latency, and a low frequency resolution is used for STFT following the short window length. However, this low frequency resolution may limit the enhancement performance [1], [23], [24]. In the recent Clarity challenge, almost all the top teams [25]–[27] adopt time-domain networks such as Conv-TasNet [7], [28], which can use very short window and hop sizes to potentially realize very low-latency enhancement. Conv-TasNet leverages DNN based end-to-end optimization to learn a set of bases for a small window of samples respectively for its encoder and decoder to replace the conventional STFT and iSTFT operations. The number of bases is set to be much larger than the number of samples in the window. Enhancement is then performed in the higher-dimensional encoded space and the decoder is used for overlap-add based signal re-synthesis. While achieving good separation performance in monaural anechoic speaker separation tasks, Conv-TasNet performs less impressively in reverberant conditions and in multi-microphone scenarios than frequency-domain approaches [11], [29], [30]. In addition, the basis learned by Conv-TasNet is not narrowband [7]. It is not straightforward how to combine Conv-TasNet with conventional STFT-domain enhancement algorithms to achieve further gains, without incurring additional algorithmic latency. Such conventional algorithms include beamforming and weighted prediction error (WPE), which rely on the narrow-band assumption and can produce reliable separation through their per-frequency processing [11], [31]–[33]. One way of combining them [23], [34], [35] is by iterating Conv-TasNet, which uses a very short window, with STFT-domain beamforming, which uses a regular, longer window. To use Conv-TasNet outputs to compute signal statistics for STFT-domain beamforming, one has to first re-synthesize time-domain signals before extracting STFT spectra for beamforming. Similarly, to apply Conv-TasNet on beamforming results for post-filtering, one has to apply iSTFT to get time-domain signals before feeding them to Conv-TasNet. Such an iterative procedure would however gradually build up the algorithmic latency, because the overlap-add algorithms are used multiple times in Conv-TasNet and iSTFT.

It is commonly perceived that regular STFT based systems, which suffer from a large algorithmic latency equal to the STFT’s typically long window length, are not ideal for very low-latency speech enhancement, and time-domain models such as Conv-TasNet, which can achieve strong performance using very short windows, appear a more appropriate choice [7]. In this study, we show that our STFT based system can also produce a comparable or better enhancement performance at an algorithmic latency as low as 4 or 2 ms. This is partially achieved by combining STFT-domain, deep learning based speech enhancement with a conventional dual window approach [36], [37], which uses a regularly long window length for STFT and a shorter window length for overlap-add. This approach is illustrated in Fig. 2. More specifically, assuming a hop size (HS) of 2 ms, we use a 16 ms input window size (IWS) for STFT, and an output window size (OWS) of 4 ms for the overlap-add in iSTFT. The 16 ms input window looks 4 ms ahead and 12 ms in the past in this case. After obtaining the predicted signal at each frame, i.e., after performing inverse discrete Fourier transform (iDFT), we throw away the first 12 ms of waveforms, apply a synthesis window, and perform...
overlap-add based on the last 4 ms of signals at each frame. The DNN module is designed to be frame-online. Therefore the entire system has an algorithmic latency of 4 ms. Later in Section VI, we will introduce a future-frame prediction technique to further reduce the algorithmic latency to 2 ms.

When used with DNNs, this dual window size approach has several advantages. First, using a long window for STFT leads to higher frequency resolution, meaning that we could have more estimated filters (or mask values) per frame to obtain more fine-grained enhancement. In addition, higher frequency resolution can better leverage the speech sparsity property in the T-F domain for enhancement [1], [24]. Second, using a longer input window can capture more reverberation at each frame, potentially leading to better dereverberation. In addition, it could lead to better spatial processing, as the inter-channel phase patterns could be more stable and salient for longer signals. Third, STFT bases are narrowband in nature, meaning that we can readily use our DNN outputs (in this study, the estimated target real and imaginary components) to compute a conventional frequency-domain beamformer, whose results can be used as extra features for another DNN to better predict the target speech.

Our study makes three major contributions. First, we adapt a conventional dual window size approach [36], [37] to reduce the algorithmic latency of STFT-domain deep learning based speech enhancement. Second, we utilize the outputs from the first DNN for frequency-domain frame-online beamforming, and the beamforming result is fed to a second DNN for better enhancement. Compared with using the outputs from time-domain models for frequency-domain beamforming, our approach does not incur algorithmic latency because the two DNNs and the beamformer all operate in the complex T-F domain. Third, we propose a future-frame prediction technique that can further reduce the algorithmic latency caused by the output window size. In our experiments, we find that the proposed STFT-domain system can achieve comparably good or better performance than the popular Conv-TasNet [7], [25], [28], using a similar amount of computation and at an algorithmic latency as low as 4 or 2 ms. There is a recent dual window size study on deep learning based speaker separation [24]. However, it is monaural, uses real-valued mask estimation, only reduces the algorithmic latency to 8 ms, and does not compare with time-domain models.

An overview of our system is given in the following section.

II. SYSTEM OVERVIEW

Given an utterance of a speaker recorded in noisy-reverberant conditions by a P-microphone array, the physical model in the STFT domain can be formulated as

\[ Y(t, f) = X(t, f) + V(t, f) \]

\[ = S(t, f) + H(t, f) + V(t, f), \]

(1)

where \( Y(t, f), V(t, f), X(t, f), S(t, f) \) and \( H(t, f) \) ∈ \( \mathbb{C}^P \) respectively denote the STFT vectors of the mixture, reverberant noise, reverberant target speech, direct-path and non-direct signals of the target speaker at time \( t \) and frequency \( f \). In the rest of this paper, when dropping \( t \) and \( f \) from the notation, we refer to the corresponding spectrogram. In our experiments, the default IWS, oWS, and HS for STFT are respectively set to 16, 4, and 2 ms, and the sampling rate is 16 kHz. A 256-point DFT is applied to extract 129-dimensional STFT coefficients at each frame. The analysis window and synthesis window will be described in Section VII.

Based on the input \( Y \), we aim at recovering the target speaker’s direct-path signal captured at a reference microphone \( q \), i.e., \( S_q \). We use the corresponding time-domain signal of \( S_q \), denoted as \( s_q \), as the reference signal for metric computation. Note that early reflections are not considered as part of target speech. In multi-microphone cases, we assume that the same array geometry is used for training and testing, following [38], [39]. This is a valid assumption as real-world products such as smart speakers have a fixed array configuration.

Our best performing system, illustrated in Fig. 3 has two DNNs. Using the real and imaginary (RI) components of multiple input signals as input features, the DNNs are trained sequentially based on single- or multi-microphone complex spectral mapping [5], [38], [39] to predict the RI components of \( S_q \). The estimated speech by DNN1 is used to compute, at each frequency, a multi-channel Wiener filter (MCWF) [23] for the target speaker. DNN2 concatenates the RI components of the beamforming results, the outputs of DNN1, and \( Y \) as features to further estimate the RI components of \( S_q \). The DNN1, DNN2, and MCWF modules are all designed to be frame-online, so that we can readily plug our two-DNN system into Fig. 2 to achieve enhancement with very low algorithmic latency. Note that such two-DNN systems with a beamformer in between have been explored in our previous studies [11], [38]–[40], but their target was offline processing. This paper extends them for frame-online processing with a very low algorithmic latency.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section III details the DNN configurations, Section IV describes the DNN-supported beamforming, and Section V presents the proposed enhancement system with low algorithmic latency. Experimental setup and evaluation results are presented in Sections VI and VII. Section VIII concludes this paper.

III. DNN CONFIGURATIONS

Our DNNs are trained to do complex spectral mapping [5], where the real and imaginary (RI) components of multiple signals are concatenated as input for DNNs to predict the target RI components at a reference microphone. This section describes the loss functions and the DNN architectures. The key differences from our earlier studies [11], [38]–[40] include the facts that (1) we train through the dual window size approach and define the loss function on the re-synthesized
A. Loss Functions

The two DNNs in Fig. [4] are trained using different loss functions. For DNN1, following [38], [39], [41] the loss function is defined on the predicted RI components and their magnitude

\[
\mathcal{L}_{RI+Mag} = \|\hat{R}_q^{(1)} - \text{Real}(S_q)\|_1 + \|\hat{I}_q^{(1)} - \text{Imag}(S_q)\|_1 + \|\sqrt{\hat{R}_q^{(2)}^2 + \hat{I}_q^{(2)}^2} - |S_q|\|_1,
\]

(2)

where \(\hat{R}_q^{(1)}\) and \(\hat{I}_q^{(1)}\) are the predicted RI components by DNN1, \(\text{Real}(\cdot)\) and \(\text{Imag}(\cdot)\) extract RI components, and \(\|\cdot\|_1\) computes the \(L_1\) norm. The estimated target spectrogram at the reference microphone \(q\) is \(\hat{S}_q^{(1)} = \hat{R}_q^{(1)} + j\hat{I}_q^{(1)}\), where \(j\) denotes the imaginary unit.

Given the predicted RI components \(\hat{R}_q^{(2)}\) and \(\hat{I}_q^{(2)}\) by DNN2, we denote \(\hat{S}_q^{(2)} = \hat{R}_q^{(2)} + j\hat{I}_q^{(2)}\) and compute the re-synthesized signal \(\hat{s}_q^{(2)} = \text{iSTFT}(\hat{S}_q^{(2)})\), where \(\text{iSTFT}(\cdot)\) uses a shorter output window for overlap-add to reduce the algorithmic latency (see Fig. [2]). The loss function is then defined on the re-synthesized time-domain signal and its STFT magnitude

\[
\mathcal{L}_{Wav+Mag} = \|\hat{s}_q^{(2)} - s_q\|_1 + \|\text{STFT}_{L}(\hat{s}_q^{(2)}) - |\text{STFT}_{L}(s_q)|\|_1,
\]

(3)

where \(\text{STFT}_{L}(\cdot)\) extracts a complex spectrogram. The loss on magnitude is found to consistently improve objective metrics such as PESQ and STOI [41]. Note that \(\text{STFT}_{L}(\cdot)\) can use any window type and window and hop sizes, and can be different from the ones we use to extract \(Y\) and \(S_q\), since it is only used for loss computation. In our experiments, we use the square-root Hann window, a 32 ms window size and an 8 ms hop size to compute this magnitude loss. Please do not confuse these STFT parameters with the STFT parameters we used to extract \(Y\) and \(S_q\).

In our experiments, we will compare the two-DNN system with a single-DNN system (i.e., without the beamforming module and the second DNN). In the single-DNN case, DNN1 can be trained using either Eq. (2) or (3). Differently, in the two-DNN case, DNN1 is trained only using Eq. (2). This is because the beamformer we will derive later in Eq. (4) is based on a DNN-estimated target in the complex domain.

B. Network Architecture

Our DNN architecture, denoted as LSTM-ResUNet, is illustrated in Fig. [4]. It is a long short-term memory (LSTM) network clamped by a U-Net [42]. Residual blocks are inserted at multiple frequency scales in the encoder and decoder of the U-Net. The motivation of this network design is that U-Net can maintain fine-grained local structure via its skip connections and model contextual information along frequency through down- and up-sampling. LSTM can leverage long-range information, and residual blocks can improve discriminability. We stack the RI components of different input and output signals as features maps in the network input and output. DNN1 and DNN2 differ only in their network input. DNN1 uses the RI components of \(Y\) to predict the RI components of \(S_q\), and DNN2 additionally uses as input the RI components of \(\hat{S}_q^{(1)}\) and a beamforming result \(\hat{S}_q^{(2)}\), which will be described later in Section [V]. The encoder contains one two-dimensional (2D) convolution followed by causal layer normalization (cauLN) for each input signal, and six convolutional blocks, each with 2D convolution, parametric ReLU (PReLU) non-linearity, and batch normalization (BN), for down-sampling. The LSTM contains three layers, each with 300 units. The decoder includes six blocks of 2D deconvolution, PReLU, and BN, and one 2D deconvolution, for up-sampling. Each residual block in the encoder and decoder contains five depthwise separable 2D convolution (denoted as dsConv2D) blocks, where the dilation rate along time are respectively 1, 2, 4, 8 and 16. Linear activation is used in the output layer to obtain the predicted RI components.

All the convolution and normalization layers are causal (i.e., frame-online) at run time. We use \(1 \times 3\) or \(1 \times 4\) kernels along time and frequency for the down- and up-sampling convolutions, following [10]. Causal \(2 \times 3\) convolutions are used in the residual blocks, following [10].

Note that this architecture is similar to the earlier TCN-DenseUNet architecture [11], [34], [40]. Major changes include replacing the DenseNet blocks with residual blocks.
and replacing regular 2D convolutions with depthwise separable 2D convolutions. These changes dramatically reduce the amount of computation and the number of trainable parameters. The network contains around 2.3 million parameters. It uses similar amount of computation compared with the Conv-TasNet used in our experiments.

IV. FREQUENCY-DOMAIN BEAMFORMING

Based on the DNN-estimated target RI components, we compute an online multi-channel Wiener filter (MCWF) \(^{(33)}\) to enhance target speech (see Fig. 3). The MCWF is computed per frequency, leveraging the narrow-band property of STFT. Although the beamforming result of such a filter usually does not show better scores in terms of enhancement metrics than the immediate DNN outputs, it can provide complementary information to help DNN2 obtain better enhancement results \(^{(11), (39), (43)}\). Note that our main contribution here is to show that frame-online frequency-domain beamforming can be easily integrated with our STFT-domain DNNs to improve enhancement, while not incurring any algorithmic latency.

We can use more advanced beamformers, or dereverberation algorithms such as WPE \(^{(11), (31), (32)}\), to achieve even better enhancement than MCWF. They are however out of the scope of this study. This section will first describe the offline time-invariant implementation of the MCWF beamformer and then extend it to frame-online.

The MCWF \(^{(33)}\) computes a linear filter per T-F unit or per frequency to project the mixture to target speech. Assuming the target speaker does not move within each utterance and based on the DNN-estimated target speech \(\hat{s}^{(1)}(t,f)\), we compute a time-invariant MCWF per frequency through the following minimization problem

\[
\min_{w(f; q)} \sum \left| \hat{s}^{(1)}(t,f) - w(f; q)^H Y(t,f) \right|^2,
\]

where \(q\) denotes the reference microphone and \(w(f; q) \in \mathbb{C}^r\) is a \(P\)-dimensional filter. Since the objective is quadratic, a closed-form solution is available

\[
\hat{w}(f; q) = \left( \hat{\Phi}^{(yy)}(f) \right)^{-1} \hat{\Phi}^{(ys)}(f) u_q,
\]

\[
\hat{\Phi}^{(yy)}(f) = \sum_t Y(t,f) Y(t,f)^H,
\]

\[
\hat{\Phi}^{(ys)}(f) = \sum_t Y(t,f) \hat{S}^{(1)}(t,f)^H,
\]

where \(\hat{\Phi}^{(yy)}(f)\) denotes the observed mixture spatial covariance matrix, \(\hat{\Phi}^{(ys)}(f)\) the estimated covariance matrix between the mixture and the target speaker, and \(u_q\) is a one-hot vector with element \(q\) equal to one. Notice that we do not need to first fully compute the matrix \(\hat{\Phi}^{(ys)}(f)\) and then take its \(q\)th column by multiplying it with \(u_q\), because

\[
\hat{\Phi}^{(ys)}(f) u_q = \sum_t Y(t,f) \hat{S}^{(1)}(t,f)^* u_q,
\]

where \((\cdot)^*\) computes complex conjugate. The beamforming result is computed as

\[
\hat{s}^{MCWF}(t,f) = \hat{w}(f; q)^* Y(t,f).
\]

We point out that the DNN-estimated magnitude and phase can both be used for computing the beamformer and we only need to use our DNN to estimate the target speech at the reference microphone \(q\). Differently, to leverage DNN-estimated magnitude and phase to compute a beamformer, earlier studies estimate the target speech at all the microphones by training a multi-channel input and multi-channel output network that can predict the target speech at all the microphones at once \(^{(15), (38)}\), or by running a well-trained multi-channel input and single-channel output network \(P\) times at inference time \(^{(30), (39)}\), where each microphone is considered as the reference microphone in turn. However, the former approach produces worse separation at each microphone than the latter, probably because there are many more signals to predict \(^{(38)}\), and the latter dramatically increases the amount of computation \(^{(39)}\).

Differently from Eqs. (5)-(7), in a frame-online setup the statistics are accumulated online, similarly to \(^{(44)}\), and the beamformer at each time step is computed as

\[
\hat{w}(t,f; q) = \left( \hat{\Phi}^{(yy)}(t,f) \right)^{-1} \hat{\Phi}^{(ys)}(t,f) u_q,
\]

\[
\hat{\Phi}^{(yy)}(t,f) = \hat{\Phi}^{(yy)}(t-1,f) + Y(t,f) Y(t,f)^H,
\]

\[
\hat{\Phi}^{(ys)}(t,f) = \hat{\Phi}^{(ys)}(t-1,f) + Y(t,f) \hat{S}^{(1)}(t,f)^H,
\]

with \(\hat{\Phi}^{(yy)}(0,f)\) and \(\hat{\Phi}^{(ys)}(0,f)\) initialized to be all-zero. Based on the online time-varying filter \(\hat{w}(t,f; q)\), the beamforming result is obtained as

\[
\hat{s}^{MCWF}(t,f) = \hat{w}(t,f; q)^* Y(t,f).
\]

Similarly to \(^{(44)}\), in a frame-online setup \(\hat{\Phi}^{(yy)}(t)^{-1}\) in Eq. (10) can be computed iteratively according to the Woodbury formula, i.e.,

\[
\hat{\Phi}^{(yy)}(t)^{-1} = (\hat{\Phi}^{(yy)}(t-1) + Y(t) Y(t)^H)^{-1}
\]

\[
= \hat{\Phi}^{(yy)}(t-1)^{-1}
\]

\[-
\hat{\Phi}^{(yy)}(t) Y(t) Y(t)^H \hat{\Phi}^{(yy)}(t-1)^{-1}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{1 + Y(t)^H \hat{\Phi}^{(yy)}(t-1)^{-1} Y(t)},
\]

where the frequency index \(f\) is dropped to make the equation less cluttered. This way, expensive matrix inversion at each T-F unit is avoided in the frame-online case.

V. ENHANCEMENT WITH LOW ALGORITHMIC LATENCY

In Fig. 3 there are two DNNs and an MCWF in between. Since the DNNs and beamformer all operate in the complex T-F domain, without going back and forth to the time domain, we can use the same STFT resolution for all of them to obtain a two-DNN system with a low algorithmic latency. This is different from earlier studies \(^{(23), (34), (55)}\) that combine time-domain models with beamforming and have to switch back and forth to the time domain. Given a small hop size (say 2 ms), we can use a regular, large iWS (for example 16 ms) for STFT to have a reasonably high frequency resolution for frequency-domain beamforming. To re-synthesize \(\hat{s}^{(2)}\) to a time-domain signal, we use the last 4 ms of the 16 ms signals produced by iDFT at each frame for overlap-add, following the procedure illustrated in Fig. 2. The resulting system has an algorithmic latency of 4 ms, even though the
STFT spectrograms are extracted using a window size of 16 ms. The rest of this section describes the analysis and synthesis windows, and a future-frame prediction technique that can further reduce the 4 ms algorithmic latency to 2 ms.

A. Analysis and Synthesis Window Design

In our experiments, we will investigate various analysis windows such as the square-root Hann (sqrtHann) window, rectangular (Rect) window, asymmetric sqrtHann (AsqrtHann) window [24, 36, 37], and Tukey window [45]. See Fig. 5 for an illustration of the windows. Our consideration for this investigation is that for windows such as the sqrtHann window, where all the last 4 ms are in the tapering range, the tapering could make the extracted frequency components in the STFT spectrograms less representative of the last 4 ms of signals, where we aim to make predictions. One solution is to use a rectangular analysis window, which does not taper samples. However, it is well-known that rectangular windows lead to more spectral leakage due to their higher frequency beamforming as well as the performance of DNNs. On the other hand, the rectangular window does not taper any samples in the right end and hence the signal in that region is not modified by the window. This could be helpful for very low-latency processing, as we need to make predictions for these samples. Our study also considers the Tukey window [45], defined as

\[
g[n] = 0.5 - 0.5 \cos \left( \frac{\pi n}{\alpha N} \right), \quad \text{if } 0 \leq n \leq \alpha N;
\]

\[
g[N - n], \quad \text{if } N - \alpha N \leq n < N;
\]

\[
eq 1, \quad \text{otherwise},
\]

where \(0 \leq n < N\) and tapering only happens at the first and the last \(\alpha N\) samples. Given a 16 ms analysis window, we set \(\alpha = \frac{1}{64}\), meaning 1 ms of tapering on both ends. We also consider the AsqrtHann window proposed in [24, 36, 37], and construct a 16 ms long AsqrtHann window by combining the first half of a 30 ms sqrtHann window and the second half of a 2 ms sqrtHann window.

We compute a synthesis window that can achieve perfect reconstruction when used with an analysis window \(g\), following [40]. Suppose that the run-time oWS in samples is \(A\) and the hop size in samples is \(B\), and that \(A\) is a multiple of \(B\), we obtain the synthesis window \(l \in \mathbb{R}^A\) based on the last \(A\) samples of the analysis window

\[
l[n] = \frac{g[N - A + n]}{\sum_{k=0}^{A/B-1} g[N - A + (n \mod B) + kB]^2},
\]

where \(0 \leq n < A\).

B. Future-Frame Prediction

We can further reduce the algorithmic latency by training the DNN to predict, say, one frame ahead. That is, at time \(t\), the DNN predicts the target RI components at frame \(t+1\). This can reduce the algorithmic latency from 4 to 2 ms. We use Fig. 2 to explain the idea. To get the prediction at sample \(n\) (see the top of Fig. 2), we need to overlap-add the last 4 ms of frame \(t\) and \(t+1\). If the DNN only predicts the current frame, we can only do the overlap-add after we fully observe frame \(t+1\) and finish feed-forwarding frame \(t+1\). In contrast, if the DNN predicts frame \(t+1\) at frame \(t\), we can do the overlap-add after we observe and finish feed-forwarding frame \(t\). The algorithmic latency is hence reduced by 2 ms. We can predict more frames ahead to reduce the algorithmic latency to 0 ms or negative, but this comes with a degradation in performance as predicting the future is often a difficult task.

In our experiments, we find that predicting one frame ahead does not dramatically degrade the performance. This is possibly because when predicting one frame ahead and using a loss function like Eq. (3) which requires training through iSTFT, at frame \(t\) we essentially use the input signals up to frame \(t\) to predict the sub-frame (marked in the top of Fig. 2) at frame \(t+1\) so that a 2 ms algorithmic latency (i.e., the length of the sub-frame) can be achieved. We find that it is then important to use the rectangular window as the analysis window and that using tapering-shaped windows produces noticeable artifacts near the boundary of each frame. If we use an analysis window which significantly tapers the right end of the input signal, such as the Tukey or sqrtHann window, the DNN model would have difficulty predicting the signals at the right boundary of the sub-frame at frame \(t\), because the input information especially near the right boundary would be lost due to the tapering.

Performance degradation is however significant when predicting two frames ahead (i.e., 4 ms in the future), and even more so when predicting three, possibly because the model now has to fully predict part of the future signal. If performance could be improved to the point that three (the value of oWS/HS + 1 in our setup) frames ahead can be accurately predicted, for example via a more powerful DNN architecture, the algorithmic latency could be reduced to \(-2\) ms. In this case, the enhancement system could potentially achieve 0 ms processing latency if the hardware latency of processing each frame can be less than the 2 ms hop size (which would be necessary to maintain real-time processing anyway).

1In other words, our DNN model in this case can fully observe the mixture signals of the sub-frame at frame \(t\), and it has the opportunity to correct at frame \(t\) the errors made when predicting at frame \(t-1\) the (then in the future) sub-frame at frame \(t\). This could be the key reason why predicting one frame ahead performs reasonably well in our experiments.
In our two-DNN system in Fig. 3 only DNN$_2$ can choose to predict future frames and DNN$_1$ always predicts the current frame.

VI. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

We evaluate the proposed algorithm on a noisy-reverberant speech enhancement task, using a single microphone or an array of microphones. This section describes the dataset, benchmark systems, and miscellaneous configurations.

A. Dataset for Noisy-Reverberant Speech Enhancement

Due to the lack of a widely adopted benchmark for multi-channel noisy-reverberant speech enhancement, we build a custom dataset based on the WSJCAM0 [47] and FSD50k [48] corpora. The clean signals in WSJCAM0 are used as the speech sources. The corpus contains 7,861, 742, and 1,088 utterances respectively in its training, validation, and test sets. Using the same split of clean signals as in WSJCAM0, we simulate 39,245 (∼77.7 hours), 2,965 (∼5.6 hours), and 3,260 (∼8.5 hours) noisy-reverberant mixtures as our training, validation, and test sets, respectively. The noise sources are from the FSD50k dataset, which contains around 50,000 Freesound clips with human-labeled sound events distributed in 200 classes drawn from the AudioSet ontology [49]. We sample the clips in the development set of FSD50k to simulate the noises for training and validation, and those in the evaluation set to simulate the noises for testing. Since our task is single-speaker speech enhancement, following [50] we filter out clips containing any sounds produced by humans, based on the provided sound event annotation of each clip. Such clips have annotations such as Human voice, Male speech and man speaking, Chuckle and chortle, Yell, etc. To generate multi-microphone noise signals, for each mixture we randomly sample up to seven noise clips. We treat each sampled clip as a point source, convolve each source with the corresponding RIR, and summate the convolved signals to create the mixture. The directions of each noise source and the target speaker to the array are independently sampled from the range $[0, 2\pi]$, so the speaker and some noises could have a similar azimuth. Following the setup in the FUSS dataset [51], which is designed for universal sound separation, we consider noise clips as background noises if they are more than 10 seconds long, and as foreground noises otherwise. Each simulated mixed noise file has one background noise and the rest are foreground noises. The energy level between the dry background noise and each dry foreground noise is drawn from the range $[-3, 9]$ dB. Considering that some FSD50k clips contain silence or digital zeros, the energy level is computed by first removing silent segments in each clip, next computing a sample variance from the remaining samples, and then scaling the clips to an energy level based on the sample variances. After summing up all the spatialized noises, we scale the summed reverberant noise such that the SNR between the target direct-path speech and the summed reverberant noise is equal to a value sampled from the range $[-8, 3]$ dB. Besides the FSD50k clips, in each mixture we always include a weak, diffuse, stationary air-conditioning noise drawn from the REVERB corpus, where the SNR between the target direct-path speech and the noise is equal to a value sampled from the range $[10, 30]$ dB. The distance between each source and the array center is drawn from the range $[0.75, 2.5]$ m. The reverberation time (T60) is drawn from the range $[0.2, 1.0]$ s. The simulated array is a six-microphone uniform circular array with a 20 cm diameter. The sampling rate is 16 kHz.

B. Benchmark Systems

We consider the frame-online Conv-TasNet [7] as the monaural benchmark system. Conv-TasNet is an excellent model. It can achieve enhancement with very low algorithmic latency through its very short window length, using a very small amount of computation. We considered other monaural time-domain approaches such as [13], which uses window sizes as large as typical STFT window sizes and also leverages overlap-add for signal re-synthesis. It has the same algorithmic latency as regular STFT based systems due to the overlap-add. The proposed dual window size approach can be straightforwardly applied to reduce its latency, but the model itself requires drastically more computation than Conv-TasNet, mainly due to its DenseNet modules. Another recent study [52] proposes to use low-overlap window for Wave-U-Net. However, a large window is used and their algorithmic latency is at least 38.4 ms. We therefore only consider Conv-TasNet as the monaural baseline. We also considered other frame-online T-F domain models such as the winning solutions in the DNS challenges [19]. However, they are targeted at teleconferencing scenarios, where a processing latency as large as 40 ms is allowed. For example, DCCRN [14] has an algorithmic latency of 62.5 ms and TSCN-PP [53] 20 ms. In addition, these models share many similarities with our complex T-F domain DNN models and can straightforwardly leverage our proposed techniques to reduce their algorithmic latency. We therefore do not include them as baselines.

We consider the frame-online multi-channel Conv-TasNet [25, 28], denoted as MC-Conv-TasNet, as the main multi-channel baseline. Compared with monaural Conv-TasNet, MC-Conv-TasNet introduces a spatial encoder in addition to the spectral encoder in the original Conv-TasNet to exploit spatial information. The spatial embedding produced by the spatial encoder is used as extra features for the network to better mask the spectral embedding. Following [25, 28], we set the spatial embedding dimension to 60 for two-channel processing and to 360 for six-channel processing. Note that MC-Conv-TasNet is also the enhancement component within the winning system [25] of the recent Clarity challenge, a major effort in advancing very low-latency speech enhancement.

The Conv-TasNet models are trained either by

$$L_{\text{Wave}} = \| \hat{s}_q - s_q \|_1,$$

(17)

where $\hat{s}_q$ denotes the predicted signal, or by Eq. (3). The magnitude loss in Eq. (3) can significantly improve speech.

\[ \text{See } \text{https://github.com/etzinis/fedenhance/blob/master/fedenhance/dataset\_maker/make\_librifsd50k.py \text{ for the full list.} \]
intelligibility and quality metrics \cite{41}. Using the notations of Conv-TasNet (in Table I of \cite{7}), the hyper-parameters are set to \( N = 512, B = 158, S_c = 158, H = 512, P = 3, X = 8, \) and \( R = 3 \) for the single- and multi-channel Conv-TasNets. \( B \) and \( S_c \) here are slightly larger than the default 128 in \cite{7}, since in multi-channel processing there are additional spatial embeddings concatenated to the 512-dimensional spectral embedding as the input to the TCN module of Conv-TasNet.

\textbf{C. Miscellaneous Configurations}

The MCWF beamforming filter is updated at each frame. We pad (iWS – HS) ms of zero samples at the beginning of each mixture. Without the padding, the algorithmic latency for the starting samples would be higher.

For metric computation, we always use the target direct-path signal as the reference. It is obtained by setting the T60 parameter to zero when generating RIRs. Our main evaluation metric is the scale-invariant signal-to-distortion ratio (SI-SDR) \cite{54}, which measures the quality of time-domain sample-level predictions. We also report extended short-time objective intelligibility (eSTOI) \cite{55} and perceptual evaluation of speech quality (PESQ) scores. For PESQ, narrow-band MOS-LQO scores based on the ITU P.862.1 standard \cite{56} are reported using the \texttt{python-pesq} toolkit.

For the DNN models, we use the \texttt{pflops} toolkit\footnote{https://github.com/ludlows/python-pesq, v0.0.2} to count the number of floating-point operations (FLOPs) to process a 4-second mixture. When reporting the FLOPs of an STFT-based system, we summate the DNN FLOPs and the FLOPs of beamforming, STFT, and iSTFT. Note that two FLOPs is roughly equivalent to one multiply–accumulate operation.

\section{Evaluation Results}

Tables I, III and IV report the results of one-, six- and two-microphone enhancement, respectively. In each table, we provide the algorithmic latency of each model, along with the number of model parameters and FLOPs. When comparing the results, we always take into account the algorithmic latency and the amount of computation.

\textbf{A. Comparison of Loss Functions}

We observe that training through the proposed overlap-add procedure using the Wav+Mag loss function in Eq. (3) leads to clear improvement over using the RI+Mag loss in Eq. (2), which does not train through the signal re-synthesis procedure. This can be observed from entries 1a vs. 1b in Table I 1a-1d vs. 2a-2d in Table II and 1a vs. 1b in Table III and IV. Using the Wav+Mag loss in Eq. (3) rather than the Wave loss in Eq. (17) dramatically improves Conv-TasNet’s scores on PESQ and STOI (see 3a vs. 3b in Table III and 5a vs. 5b in III and IV). This aligns with our findings in \cite{41}, which only deals with offline enhancement.

\textbf{B. Comparison of Analysis Windows}

We first look at the case where, at each frame, the DNNs are trained to make predictions for the current frame. When using
work very well (see 2a and 2b vs. 2c in Table I, and 3a and in III and IV). In the end, the Tukey window leads to worse leads to more degradation (see 1b vs. 1c in Tables I, III and one frame ahead, which can reduce the algorithmic latency better than the others. This can also be observed from 1a-1d sqrtHann, AsqrtHann, rectangular, and Tukey windows does not produce notable differences in performance. This can be seen that with a beamformer and a post-filtering network, its higher frame overlap.

Comparing 1b and 2a, and 3a and 4a of Table III, we can see that using 4/1 ms window/hop sizes yields consistently better in terms of SI-SDR.

C. Effectiveness of Beamforming

Comparing 1b and 2a, and 3a and 4a of Table III we can see that with a beamformer and a post-filtering network, DNN₁+MCWF+DNN₂ leads to clear improvements especially on PESQ and eSTOI over using DNN₁. Similar trend is observed by comparing 1b and 2a, as well as 3a and 4a of Table IV.

D. Comparison with Conv-TasNet

In Tables I, III and IV we provide the results obtained by single- or multi-channel Conv-TasNet. We experiment with 4/2, 4/1, and 2/1 ms window/hop sizes. Their algorithmic latencies are respectively 4, 4, and 2 ms, and the latter two almost double the amount of computation used by the first one due to their reduced hop size. In all tables, we found that using 4/1 ms window/hop sizes yields consistently better enhancement scores than the other two, possibly because of its higher frame overlap.
Let us first look at Table [I] the monaural results. Our models use fewer number of parameters than Conv-TasNet (i.e., 2.32 M vs. 6.18 M). When the algorithmic latency is restrained to 4 ms, our system 1b (and 2a) produces better enhancement performance not only than 3b, using a similar number of FLOPs, but also than the best Conv-TasNet model 3c, using around half of the FLOPs. When the algorithmic latency is limited to 2 ms, the proposed 2b, which predicts one frame ahead, shows better scores than 3d, using around half of the FLOPs.

We now look at Table [II]. At 4 ms algorithmic latency, 1b and 3a show slightly better (or comparable in some metrics) results than 5b, using a similar number of FLOPs. The DNN₁+MCWF+DNN₂ model contains two DNNs and hence at least doubles the amount of computation of DNN₁. At 4 ms algorithmic latency, our systems in 2a and 4a show clearly better enhancement scores than 5c, using a comparable number of FLOPs. In 4b, DNN₂ predicts one frame ahead and reduces the algorithmic latency to 2 ms. The enhancement scores are clearly better than those in 5d, which also have an algorithmic latency of 2 ms, again using a similar number of FLOPs. Indeed, 4b uses two DNNs, each operating at a hop size of 2 ms, and 5d only uses one DNN but the DNN operates at a hop size of 1 ms. The comparison between 4b and 5d suggests a new and promising way of achieving speech enhancement with a very low algorithmic latency. Earlier studies like time-domain methods [7], [9] tend to use very small window and hop sizes to reduce the algorithmic latency and improve the performance, but this significantly increases the amount of computation due to an increased number of frames. Differently, we could use larger window and hop sizes (and hence fewer frames) together with more powerful DNN models (such as the proposed two-DNN system with a beamformer in between, which uses more computation at each frame), and at the same time use the proposed future-frame prediction technique to reduce the algorithmic latency.

Similar trends as in Table [II] can be observed in [IV] for two-microphone enhancement.

These comparisons suggest that we can achieve reasonably good speech enhancement with an algorithmic latency as low as 2 ms in the STFT domain, and that operating in the STFT domain may rival or even outperform processing in the time domain for speech enhancement with very low algorithmic latency.

E. Towards Zero Processing Latency

In systems 2c and 2d of Table [II] and 4c and 4d of Tables [III] and [IV] we train our DNNs to predict two or three frames ahead. This further reduces the algorithmic latency at the cost of a degradation in performance, compared with the case when we predict one frame ahead. The degradation is particularly large for SI-SDR, likely because predicting the phase of future frames is difficult. PESQ and eSTOI, which are less influenced by phase, maintain a decent level of performance, even rivaling at 0 ms algorithmic latency in the six-microphone case with a single-DNN system or an MC-Conv-TasNet system with 4 ms algorithmic latency (see 4c vs. 1b and 5c in Table [III]). One notable advantage of predicting three frames ahead is that the enhancement system could potentially have a zero processing latency, if the hardware is powerful enough such that the hardware latency can be less than the 2 ms hop size.

VIII. Conclusion

We have adapted a dual window size approach for deep learning based speech enhancement with very low algorithmic latency in the STFT domain. Our approach can easily integrate complex T-F domain DNNs with frequency-domain beamforming to achieve better enhancement, without introducing additional algorithmic latency. A future-frame prediction technique is proposed to further reduce the algorithmic latency. Evaluation results on a simulated speech enhancement task in noisy-reverberant conditions demonstrate the effectiveness of our algorithms, and show that our STFT-based system can work well at an algorithmic latency as low as 2 ms. The proposed algorithms can be straightforwardly utilized by, or modified for, many T-F domain or time-domain speech enhancement and source separation systems to reduce their algorithmic latency.

The major limitation of our current study comes from the assumption that each frame can be processed within the hop time by hardware in an online streaming setup. This assumption may not be realistic for edge devices, such as standalone hearing aids with limited computing capability, or even for modern GPUs, unless there is careful design that can enable the system to achieve frame-by-frame online processing, especially for heavy-duty DNN models. An ideal speech enhancement system would have a small number of trainable parameters and require a small amount of run-time memory and computation, at the same time achieving high enhancement performance with very low processing latency. A practical system will likely have to strike a trade-off among these goals, and requires good engineering skills. Our current study focuses on improving enhancement performance and achieving very low algorithmic latency. Moving forward, we will consider (a) reducing the DNN complexity and using light-weight DNN blocks [57]; (b) pruning network connections [16] or quantizing DNN weights [58]; (c) reducing frequency resolution by using a shorter analysis window; and (d) performing less frequent updates of the beamforming filters.
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