

# TOPOLOGICAL DATA ANALYSIS FOR SPEECH PROCESSING

Eduard Tulchinskii, Kristian Kuznetsov, Laida Kushnareva, Daniil Cherniavskii,  
Serguei Barannikov, Irina Piontkovskaya, Sergey Nikolenko, Evgeny Burnaev

Noah’s Ark Lab, Huawei

## ABSTRACT

We apply topological data analysis (TDA) to speech classification problems and to the introspection of a pretrained speech model, HuBERT. To this end, we introduce a number of topological and algebraic features derived from Transformer attention maps and embeddings. We show that a simple linear classifier built on top of such features outperforms a fine-tuned classification head. In particular, we achieve an improvement of about 9% accuracy and 5% ERR on four common datasets; on *CREMA-D*, the proposed feature set reaches a new state of the art performance with accuracy 80.155. We also show that topological features are able to reveal functional roles of speech Transformer heads; e.g., we find the heads capable to distinguish between pairs of sample sources (natural/synthetic) or voices without any downstream fine-tuning. Our results demonstrate that TDA is a promising new approach for speech analysis, especially for tasks that require structural prediction.

**Index Terms**— topological data analysis, speech, Transformers, interpretability, emotion recognition

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The paradigm of learning universal large-scale Transformer-based models has been recently transferred to speech from natural language processing [1, 2, 3]. Due to the high complexity of speech data, the preferred way of downstream task adaptation for such models is to keep pretrained weights frozen and fine-tune small task-specific heads [4], so it is important to use the model’s hidden states in the most efficient way. A common approach is to use outputs of the last layer of the model, combining them via various pooling methods; but it has been shown that for some tasks, e.g. phoneme prediction in HuBERT or the analogy task in BERT, embeddings from lower and middle layers are more useful [5]. *Topological data analysis* (TDA) is a recently proposed way to get more efficient data representations from frozen Transformer weights [6, 7]. TDA features prove to be better suited for many downstream tasks, including artificial text detection and linguistic acceptability judgement. In particular, for ungrammatical sentence detection conventional sentence embeddings yield classification quality no better than random,

while TDA has led to meaningful results. Inspired by these results, in this work we apply TDA to the HuBERT model in order to build more powerful speech representations.

TDA has already been applied to signals of various nature; previous attempts for speech used topological statistics of the audio signal waveform: persistent entropy for noise classification [8] and emotion recognition [9], detection of a periodic signal in noisy data [10] etc. However, TDA for Transformer-based models has so far been limited to NLP, processing attention maps for artificial text detection [6, 11] and linguistic acceptability [7] and word embeddings for dialogue term extraction [12] and constructing story trees [13]. Evolution of inner representations in neural networks has been studied with persistent Betti numbers [14] and recently introduced representation topology divergence (RTD) [15]. In this work, we apply RTD in particular to intermediate embeddings and attention maps of a speech Transformer.

Another interesting area of TDA applications is the interpretation of pretrained Transformer models: it is known in NLP that different heads are sensitive to different phenomena [5]. With TDA techniques, we demonstrate the same effect for speech Transformers, finding heads that are best for solving specific downstream tasks, e.g. separating a given pair of emotions, a given pair of speakers, detecting speech generated by a specific TTS model, or representing spectral features of sound samples (bit rate, LPCC etc.). We also investigate the pattern structure of attention maps in HuBERT with pattern classification methods [16] and demonstrate that our TDA-based approach is able to extract meaningful representation from heads with any pattern types.

## 2. METHODS

In this section, we describe our approach. We first introduce topological data analysis for weighted graphs and then define the features we propose to extract.

**Graph homologies.** Given a set of points in a high-dimensional space, TDA proposes ways to restore the underlying lower-dimensional manifold and study its topological properties. If the set of points has a graph structure, the  $d$ -dimensional manifold can be obtained in the form of a *simplicial complex*. Informally speaking, it is the structure obtained by replacing  $k+1$ -cliques in the graph by filled-in  $k$ -dimensional

simplices for all  $0 \leq k \leq d$ : 0-dimensional simplices are vertices, 1-dimensional are edges, for  $k = 2$  we get triangles, for  $k = 3$ , tetrahedrons, and so on [17]. *Homology groups* are key topological features for the classification of topological spaces [18]. Dimensions of the sequence of homology groups  $H_k$ ,  $k \geq 0$ , are between of the main topological invariants. In the case of graph-like structures,  $\dim H_0$  equals the number of connected components,  $\dim H_1$  is the number of “loops”, and  $\dim H_k$  counts  $k$ -dimensional “holes”.

**Persistent homologies for weighted graphs and point clouds.** We would like to apply TDA to sets of vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  (embeddings). Such a set (point cloud) can be viewed as a complete graph  $G$  with edges weighted by any distance-like measure between vectors. However, homology groups are only defined for unweighted graphs, so we make  $G$  unweighted by thresholding, leaving only edges with weights lower than a given  $\epsilon$ ; we denote the resulting graph by  $G_\epsilon$ .

TDA can track the changes of topology across varying thresholds via *persistent homology*. In this case, we build a family of graphs called a *filtration*: an ordered set of graphs  $\Gamma_\epsilon$  for a sequence of increasing  $\epsilon$ . For  $\epsilon$  below the minimal distance between vertices the graph has no edges; as  $\epsilon$  increases new edges are added, ending in the complete graph; during this process, gradual changes of graph topology can be expressed in terms of “birth” or “death” of basic features. We begin with  $|V|$  connected components (all of them are “born”), and as  $\epsilon$  increases, pairs of them are joined together (one component “dies”). “Birth” and “death” moments can be represented with a diagram called the *barcode* [19, 15], whose horizontal axis is a sequence of thresholds  $\epsilon$ , and each horizontal bar corresponds to a single feature.  $H_0$ -bars correspond to connected components; they start at the minimal distance between vertices and correspond to edges of the minimal spanning tree (MST).  $H_1$ -bars correspond to simple cycles with more than 3 vertices; an  $H_1$ -bar starts when a cycle appears and ends when it is broken into triangles by a new edge. We denote by  $H_k^m(G)$  the average length of  $H_k$ -bars for a weighted graph or point cloud  $G$ .

*Representation topology divergence* (RTD) measures the topological dissimilarity between two data representations, formalized as two weighted graphs  $G^a$  and  $G^b$  with a common set of vertices. Namely, we track how the topology of the graph  $G_\epsilon^a \cap G_\epsilon^b$  changes as the filtration threshold  $\epsilon$  increases. These changes are then summarized via a special kind of barcode, called the *cross-barcode*, which reflects how much graphs  $G^a$  and  $G^b$  have in common on different scales. Our RTD feature is equal to the sum of bar lengths in this barcode. For a more general and formal definition, see [15].

**Features.** We use three groups of features: algebraic features of attention matrices, topological features of attention matrices, and topological features of embeddings; for comparison, we also pool embeddings from all layers.

We count the number of features for the HuBERT-base model [1] that consists of 12 layers with 12 attention heads

each and has embedding dimension 768.

*Algebraic features* include the sum of the upper triangular part of the  $n \times n$  attention matrix (normalized by  $n^2$ ), which is used as a measure of asymmetry, and mean values of its 3 longest diagonals. This yields 4 features per attention map, 576 for the entire HuBERT model.

*Topological features of attention matrices* include the  $H_0^m$  feature for two graphs derived from each attention matrix  $A_{\text{attn}}$ .  $H_0^{m,\text{sym}}$  is defined as  $H_0^m$  for the graph with adjacency matrix  $A' = 1 - \max(A_{\text{attn}}, A_{\text{attn}}^\top)$ , that is, the symmetrization of  $A_{\text{attn}}$  (cf. [6]).  $H_0^{m,\text{pc}}$  is defined as  $H_0^m$  for the rows of  $A_{\text{attn}}$  considered as a point cloud with the  $L_1$ -distance. Here we have 2 features per attention map, 288 in total.

*Topological features of embeddings.* Considering the  $i$ -th layer’s embeddings  $X^{(i)}$  as a point cloud with the  $L_2$ -distance, we calculate 3 features for each layer:  $H_0^m(X^{(i)})$ , RTD between  $X^{(i)}$  and the last layer’s embeddings  $X^{(L)}$ , and RTD between  $X^{(i)}$  and initial embeddings  $X^{(0)}$ . Besides, we add the same 3 features for mel-frequency cepstral coefficients (MFCC), i.e., baseline speech embeddings in  $\mathbb{R}^{13}$ . This gives us 51 features for the entire model.

*Embeddings from all layers.* An alternative approach, inspired by [20], is to use pooled embeddings from each layer (not only the last) of the Transformer. We explored two pooling strategies: averaging over the timescale (common for speech Transformers) and taking only the first embedding as suggested in [20]. This yields 9216 features in each case.

### 3. EVALUATION

**Datasets.** We have used four standard datasets for speech and emotion recognition. **IEMOCAP**, introduced in [21], contains  $\approx 12$  hours of audiovisual data, including video, speech, motion capture of faces, and text transcriptions; we use only speech samples from the “Anger”, “Sadness”, “Happiness”, and “Neutral” classes (4490 samples), with 5-fold cross-validation, similar to [22, 23]. **CREMA-D** [24] has 7442 clips from 91 actors who spoke 12 different sentences in one of six basic emotions (anger, disgust, fear, happy, neutral, and sad); we perform multi-class classification with 6 classes and evaluate by averaging five splits with 70/15/15% train/development/evaluation subsets. **ASVspoof** [25] was presented for the 3rd Automatic Speaker Verification Spoofing and Countermeasures Challenge; we used the standard split with 25380 training, 24844 development, and 71237 evaluation samples and performed classification into generated and bonafide labels, a standard task on ASVspoof [26]. **VoxCeleb1** [27] contains over 100K utterances by 1251 celebrities extracted from *YouTube* videos; we performed binary classification between pairs of utterances from the same or different speakers, with 40000 pairs in the training set, 8000 in development, and 37720 in the test set; in this dataset, we clip each utterance to the first 5 seconds for all

**Table 1.** Experimental results; \* — from SUPERB [4].

Model	IEMOCAP Acc ↑	CREMA-D Acc ↑	ASVSpooF EER ↓	VoxCeleb1 EER ↓
HuBERT (baseline)	64.92*	71.047 ±0.566	6.649	<b>5.11*</b>
All layer embs, 1st	65.612 ±1.050	71.320 ±0.479	2.706	42.701
All layer embs, mean	69.355 ±1.801	76.260 ±1.148	<b>1.519</b>	6.513
Attention features	69.666 ±1.174	79.200 ±1.240	2.138	30.326
Attn. & non-attn. feat.	<b>69.955</b> ± <b>0.972</b>	<b>80.155</b> ± <b>0.680</b>	1.946	26.443

methods except embeddings from layers.

**Models.** We utilize the *HuBERT Base* model [1] pretrained for automatic speech recognition on 960 hours of audio from the *Librespeech* corpus [28]. We use HuBERT as a pretrained frozen instance, without fine-tuning or any other adjustment of the weights. We use a linear layer trained over the pooled output of the Transformer as the baseline, which is consistent with the SUPERB leaderboard [4]; we used the results for IEMOCAP and VoxCeleb1 published there and trained the baselines ourselves for CREMA-D and ASVSpooF.

As our approach, we train a logistic regression model with  $L_1$ -regularization over the set of features computed from HuBERT attention maps and/or embeddings. For automatic speaker verification (i.e., checking if two utterances are made by the same person) we compute the absolute value of elementwise differences between features of both utterances.

**Experimental results.** Our results on all four datasets are shown in Table 1; we report accuracy (Acc, in %) and equal error rate (EER, in %) for models trained on four different sets of features (see Section 2): (1) *Attention features* is a combination of algebraic and topological features calculated from attention maps; (2) *Attn. & non-attn. feat.* denotes a combination of algebraic and topological features of attention maps and topological features of embeddings; this combines all our TDA features for this task; (3) *All layer embs, 1st* is the concatenation of first embeddings from all HuBERT layers; (4) *All layer embs, mean* is the concatenation of all HuBERT embeddings with timescale averaging.

First, on all datasets averaging the embeddings is a much better strategy than taking just the first. One reason might be that NLP Transformers that often use the first embedding insert a fictional first token that “represents” the text as a whole, while HuBERT does not do this.

Second, adding non-attention features improves performance compared to just attention features, as expected since they contain more information, although for IEMOCAP the improvement is quite marginal. Third, topological features give better results than embeddings from all layers on multi-class emotion recognition datasets (IEMOCAP, CREMA-D),

while on two others the results are opposite. On all datasets except VoxCeleb1 we achieve major improvements over the baseline (conventional usage of HuBERT). Poor performance of TDA features on VoxCeleb1 might be due to the fact that we used only short clips from each utterance due to high computational costs of TDA methods over large inputs. For CREMA-D, our model achieves a new state of the art result, improving the previous SOTA of 70.95% [29] by over 9%.


#### 4. TDA FOR ATTENTION MAPS INTERPRETATION

**Restricted tasks.** Inspired by recent works on attention interpretability in natural language processing [5], we analyze the roles of individual attention heads in HuBERT. Since their “areas of expertise” are much more narrow than general problems considered above, we use two restricted tasks: separation of individual models (one synthetic model vs real speech) and separation (binary classification) of two speakers.


For individual model separation, we collected all samples produced by a given synthetic model and an equal amount of bonafide samples (real speech) randomly selected from train and validation sets. For each HuBERT attention head, we calculated the distributions of the  $H_0^{m, sym}$  feature for synthetic and real samples and ranked the heads by separation quality defined as  $SQ_{1,2} = \frac{|m_1 - m_2|}{\max(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)}$ , where  $m_i$  are the means and  $\sigma_i$  are the variances of classes. Fig. 1 shows sample separations; it turns out that for every voice model there are several heads that separate them well ( $SQ > 1$ ) and for most models there are heads that separate them very well ( $SQ > 3$ ). The best heads are different and are usually situated in the middle-to-top layers of HuBERT. The worst results were obtained on the A19 model that was specially fine-tuned on evaluation data (best  $SQ = 1.45$ ). Separation quality of the threshold classifier for the best head varies from EER 0.03% for the A14 model ( $SQ = 3.5$ ) to EER 36.5% for the A19 model. For individual speaker separation, a similar approach on ASVSpooF also shows that every pair of speakers has heads with good separation ( $SQ > 1$ ), but this time there are no heads with  $SQ > 3$ . On the other hand, more general tasks are not handled well by individual heads; e.g. the best achieved separation of male vs female speakers has  $SQ = 0.72$ . Full results for all experiments are presented at the companion website<sup>1</sup>.

**Attention maps and spectral features.** Transformer-based models such as HuBERT do not implement spectral methods intentionally, but their attention mechanisms can extract a lot of various information, so we searched for potential similarities between TDA features and common spectral features. Following [30], we extract the main spectral features for samples from the ASVSpooF dataset (real human speech only) and compute Pearson correlations between them and attention features. Fig. 2 shows the results for  $H_0^{m, pc}$ ; some (but not all) spectral features have a “counterpart” in attention maps.


<sup>1</sup><https://topohubert.github.io/speech-topology-webpages>




**Fig. 1.**  $H_0^{m, \text{sym}}$  for the best heads for individual model separation. Blue: human speech, red: synthetic speech; dashed line: optimal classification.



**Fig. 2.** Spectral features with strong correlations with  $H_0^{m, \text{PC}}$ .




**Fig. 3.** Types of attention heads in HuBERT.



**Fig. 4.** Accuracy of each head broken into pattern types.

**Categorizing attention maps in HuBERT.** To show the relation between input speech specifics, HuBERT patterns, and topological features, we categorized HuBERT patterns following [16], classifying attention heads into three categories: *global*, *vertical*, and *diagonal* based on three metrics that evaluate their entropy  $\mathbb{H}$  averaged over utterances  $u$ . For a head  $h$  and its attention map  $A^u \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ , we compute its globalness  $G_h = \mathbb{E}_u[\frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{H}(A_{i*}^u)]$ , verticality  $V_h = \mathbb{E}_u[-\mathbb{H}(\frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^d A_{i*}^u)]$ , and diagonality  $D_h = \mathbb{E}_u[-\frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^d |i-j| \cdot A_{ij}^u]$ , choosing the type based on the highest rank according to these metrics. Fig. 3 shows that heads in lower layers tend to be global, while higher layers are mostly vertical. To show how these types interact with TDA features, we compute the accuracy based on  $H_0^m$  for a subsample of IEMOCAP (angry vs. sad). Fig. 4 shows that, similar to [16], diagonal heads are more important for classification performance, but sometimes  $H_0$ -bars can extract valuable information even from global and vertical heads.

Fig. 5 illustrates the patterns arising for various input classes. We took head 4 from layer 2 since it performs well in this classification. The middle and right columns of Fig. 5 show typical examples of “angry” and “sad” classes: original attention maps, symmetrized matrices and minimal spanning trees. A more concentrated and narrower diagonal pattern and less branching MST arise for the “angry” class (top). Interestingly, lower values of  $H_0^m$  and clearer diagonal patterns



**Fig. 5.** Sample MSTs: angry (top) vs. sad (bottom).

correspond to loud utterances with lots of words per second and background dialog, while sparse and noisy patterns with larger  $H_0^m$  values correspond to slow and lifeless speech from the “sad” class (see the companion website for examples).

## 5. CONCLUSION

In this work, we have applied topological data analysis to solving downstream tasks based on a pretrained HuBERT model and analysis and interpretation of individual attention heads. We have shown that TDA yields compact feature sets that give excellent results for tasks such as emotion recognition and speaker classification, including a new state of the art result on CREMA-D. We believe that topological analysis is an important and currently underexplored venue of research for large machine learning models such as Transformers, and propose TDA as a potentially fruitful direction of study.

## 6. REFERENCES

- [1] W.-N. Hsu et al., “Hubert: Self-supervised speech representation learning by masked prediction of hidden units,” *IEEE/ACM Trans. Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 29, pp. 3451–3460, 2021.
- [2] Alexei Baevski et al., “wav2vec 2.0: A framework for self-supervised learning of speech representations,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 12449–12460, 2020.
- [3] Yu-An Chung et al., “W2v-bert: Combining contrastive learning and masked language modeling for self-supervised speech pre-training,” in *Proc. 2021 ASRU*, IEEE, 2021, pp. 244–250.
- [4] Shu wen Yang et al., “Superb: Speech processing universal performance benchmark,” in *Interspeech*, 2021.
- [5] Ivan Vulić et al., “Probing pretrained language models for lexical semantics,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.05731*, 2020.
- [6] Laida Kushnareva et al., “Artificial text detection via examining the topology of attention maps,” in *Proc. 2021 EMNLP*, 2021, pp. 635–649, ACL.
- [7] Daniil Cherniavskii et al., “Acceptability judgements via examining the topology of attention maps,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.09630*, 2022.
- [8] M. Rucco et al., “A new topological entropy-based approach for measuring similarities among piecewise linear functions,” *Signal Processing*, vol. 134, pp. 130–138, 2017.
- [9] R. Gonzalez-Diaz et al., “Towards emotion recognition: a persistent entropy application,” in *Computational Topology in Image Context*, 2019, pp. 96–109, Springer.
- [10] T. Fireaizen et al., “Alarm sound detection using topological signal processing,” in *Proc. ICASSP 2022*, pp. 211–215.
- [11] I. Perez and R. Reinauer, “The topological BERT: Transforming attention into topology for natural language processing,” *arXiv:2206.15195*, 2022.
- [12] Renato Vukovic et al., “Dialogue term extraction using transfer learning and topological data analysis,” in *Proc. 23rd SIGDial*, 2022, pp. 564–581, ACL.
- [13] Pantea Haghhighatkah et al., “Story trees: Representing documents using topological persistence,” in *Proc. 13th LREC*, June 2022, pp. 2413–2429, ELRA.
- [14] Gregory Naitzat and Andrey Zhitnikov, “Topology of deep neural networks,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 21, pp. 1–40, 01 2020.
- [15] S. Barannikov et al., “Representation Topology Divergence: A Method for Comparing Neural Network Representations,” in *Proc. 39th ICML*, PMLR 162, pp. 1607–1626, 2022.
- [16] Shu-wen Yang et al., “Understanding self-attention of self-supervised audio transformers,” in *Proc. Interspeech 2020*, pp. 3785–3789.
- [17] Toshikazu Sunada, *Homology Groups of Graphs*, pp. 37–51, Springer Japan, Tokyo, 2013.
- [18] Allen Hatcher, *Algebraic topology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.
- [19] S. Barannikov, “Canonical Forms = Persistence Diagrams. Tutorial,” in *Proc. EuroCG 2021*.
- [20] Jacob Devlin et al., “BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding,” *Proc. 2019 NAACL*, pp. 4171–4186, 2019.
- [21] Carlos Busso et al., “Iemocap: interactive emotional dyadic motion capture database,” *Language Resources and Evaluation*, vol. 42, pp. 335–359, 2008.
- [22] Gaetan Ramet et al., “Context-aware attention mechanism for speech emotion recognition,” in *Proc. 2018 IEEE SLT*, pp. 126–131.
- [23] Itai Gat et al., “Speaker normalization for self-supervised speech emotion recognition,” in *Proc. ICASSP 2022*, pp. 7342–7346.
- [24] Houwei Cao et al., “CREMA-D: Crowd-sourced emotional multimodal actors dataset,” *IEEE Trans. Affective Computing*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 377–390, 2014.
- [25] A. Nautsch et al., “ASVSpooF 2019: Spoofing countermeasures for the detection of synthesized, converted and replayed speech,” *IEEE Trans. Biometrics, Behavior, and Identity Science*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 252–265, 2021.
- [26] H. Yu et al., “Spoofing detection in automatic speaker verification systems using dnn classifiers and dynamic acoustic features,” *IEEE Trans. Neural Networks & Learning Systems*, vol. 29, pp. 4633–4644, 2018.
- [27] Arsha Nagrani et al., “VoxCeleb: A Large-Scale Speaker Identification Dataset,” in *Proc. Interspeech 2017*, pp. 2616–2620.
- [28] Vassil Panayotov et al., “Librispeech: An ASR corpus based on public domain audio books,” in *Proc. 2015 ICASSP*, pp. 5206–5210.
- [29] Florinel-Alin Croitoru et al., “Lerac: Learning rate curriculum,” *ArXiv preprint arXiv:2205.09180*, 2022.
- [30] S. Borzì et al., “Is synthetic voice detection going into the right direction?,” in *Proc. CVPR 2022*, pp. 71–80.