# Can all variations within the unified mask-based beamformer framework achieve identical peak extraction performance?

Atsuo Hiroe<sup>1\*</sup>, Katsutoshi Itoyama<sup>2</sup> and Kazuhiro Nakadai<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1\*</sup>Department of Systems and Control Engineering, School of

Engineering, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Tokyo, Japan.

<sup>2\*</sup>Honda Research Institute Japan Co., Ltd., Saitama, Japan.

\*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): hiroe@ra.sc.e.titech.ac.jp; Contributing authors: katsutoshi.itoyama@jp.honda-ri.com; nakadai@ra.sc.e.titech.ac.jp;

#### Abstract

This study investigates mask-based beamformers (BFs), which estimate filters for target sound extraction (TSE) using time-frequency masks. Although multiple mask-based BFs have been proposed, no consensus has been established on the best one for target-extracting performance. Previously, we found that maximum signal-to-noise ratio and minimum mean square error (MSE) BFs can achieve the same extraction performance as the theoretical upper-bound performance, with each BF containing a different optimal mask. However, these remarkable findings left two issues unsolved: only two BFs were covered, excluding the minimum variance distortionless response BF; and ideal scaling (IS) was employed to ideally adjust the output scale, which is not applicable to realistic scenarios. To address these coverage and scaling issues, this study proposes a unified framework for mask-based BFs comprising two processes: filter estimation that can cover all BFs and scaling applicable to realistic scenarios by employing a mask to generate a scaling reference. We also propose a methodology to enumerate all possible BFs and derive 12 variations. Optimal masks for both processes are obtained by minimizing the MSE between the target and BF output. The experimental results using the CHiME-4 dataset suggested that 1) all 12 variations can achieve the theoretical upper-bound performance, and 2) mask-based scaling can behave as IS. These results can be explained by considering the practical parameter count of the masks. These findings contribute to 1) designing a TSE system, 2) estimating the extraction performance of a BF, and 3) improving scaling accuracy combined

with mask-based scaling. The contributions also apply to TSE methods based on independent component analysis, as the unified framework covers them too.

**Keywords:** Mask-based beamformer, peak extraction performance, scaling, target sound extraction.

## 1 Introduction

Target sound extraction (TSE) estimates a sound source of interest, namely the target, from mixtures of multiple sources. This is effective in improving speech intelligibility in telecommunication systems and the performance of automatic speech recognition (ASR) systems [1, 2]. Beamformers (BFs) are employed as a linear TSE method to avoid nonlinear distortions such as musical noises and spectral distortions [2–5]. In the last decade, combined frameworks comprising BFs and deep neural networks (DNNs), referred to as mask-based BFs, have been proposed [6–8]. In these frameworks, DNNs generate one or two time-frequency (TF) masks corresponding to the target, interferences, or both to inform the BF of the sound to be enhanced or suppressed. Subsequently, the BF estimates a filter for extracting the target using these masks. For filter estimation, the following BF types are adopted: 1) maximum signalto-noise ratio (max-SNR) or generalized eigenvalue (GEV) BF [6, 7, 9], 2) minimum variance distortionless response (MVDR) BF [7, 8, 10], and 3) minimum mean square error (MMSE) or multichannel Wiener filter (MWF) BF [11–13].

Our interest is to determine which BF type can achieve the best extraction performance in estimating the target sound. Although several studies have compared multiple types [7, 14–17], no consensus has been established; some found the max-SNR BF to be the best [7, 14], whereas others favored the MMSE BF [15, 16]. In another study, performance depended on the number of microphones used [17]. Therefore, we are motivated to explore the best BF type under the same conditions.

In our previous study [18], we compared four BFs: the max-SNR BF, its two variations that use a single mask, and MMSE BF under unified conditions. We used the CHiME-3 simulated test set [19] and obtained the optimal mask for each utterance by minimizing the mean square error (MSE) between the BF output and target clean speech. Ideal scaling (IS) was employed as the unified scaling (or post-filtering) method to adjust the scale of the BF output in each frequency bin. The source-to-distortion ratio (SDR) was measured as the evaluation score. Consequently, we obtained the following findings:

- 1. All four BFs can achieve the same peak performance, comparable with the theoretical upper-bound performance obtained with the ideal MMSE.
- 2. The optimal mask is unique for each BF method.
- 3. The ideal mask for the single-channel masking differs from the optimal mask for the mask-based BFs.

Considering that the aforementioned comparative studies [7, 14–17] were based on the intuition that the optimal mask should be common for any BF and that the

peak performance achieved with the mask should differ for each BF, our findings are opposite to this. Therefore, applying these findings to the mask-based BF framework should improve extraction performance. However, the findings present two challenges: 1) not all BF types were covered, and 2) scaling the BF output did not apply to realistic scenarios.

First, our previous study only examined four BFs derived from two types, namely the max-SNR and MMSE BFs. The MVDR BF, although extensively employed, was not examined. Moreover, multiple variants can be derived within each BF type. Therefore, we need to establish a framework that covers all possible variations, rather than simply examining existing BFs.

Second, our previous study employed the IS as a common scaling method independent of BF type, whereas conventional BFs used different approaches depending on their type. This was significant for the BFs to achieve the same performance. However, the IS is not applicable to realistic scenarios because it requires the target sound as a scaling reference. Therefore, we need an alternative scaling method that is independent of the BF type, applicable to realistic scenarios, and comparative to the IS in scaling performance.

Reflecting on these aspects, we propose a unified framework for mask-based BFs. This framework consists of two mask-based processes: filter estimation and scaling. The former process can cover all variations, whereas the latter is applicable to realistic scenarios and independent of the BF variation used. Additionally, we propose a methodology to enumerate all possible variations of the mask-based BFs, identifying 12 variations in total. Using this framework and methodology, we can rephrase our interest as follows: 1) whether all possible variations can achieve the upper-bound extraction performance, and 2) whether the mask-based scaling is comparable to the IS. This study experimentally verifies these aspects by obtaining the optimal masks and discussing the reasons for the experimental results.

Through enumerating all possible variations, we found that the formulas of several variations are also employed in TSE based on the independent component analysis (ICA) theory [20–22], referred to as ICA-based TSE. Although the formulas are derived using a different formulation from mask-based BFs, this study indicates that ICA-based TSE can be treated as mask-based BFs in terms of peak extraction performance.

This study contributes to the following aspects: 1) the unified framework facilitates designing a TSE system using BFs; 2) the discussion based on the practical parameter count and saturation point can estimate the peak extraction performance of the BF used; 3) the mask-based scaling can be combined with any BF as a novel method comparable to the IS. These contributions also apply to ICA-based TSE methods.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Sections 2 and 3 overview existing mask-based BFs and ICA-based TSE methods, respectively. Section 4 proposes a unified framework for mask-based BFs. Section 5 experimentally verifies the aforementioned aspects, while Section 6 discusses the experimental results. Finally, Section 7 concludes the study.



Fig. 1 Conceptual plot of the relationship between the closeness of the BF output to the target and mask values

## 2 Overview of mask-based BFs

Given that this study examines all possible mask-based BFs, this section provides an overview of existing ones. First, we discuss peak extraction performance and the concept of the optimal mask. After introducing the signals used, we explain three major BF types, max-SNR, MMSE, and MVDR BFs, including their variants. Finally, we examine the types of masks used.

# 2.1 What is the peak extraction performance and optimal mask?

In this study, extraction performance is considered as the BF output closest to the target in the TF domain, given that a significant goal of BFs is to extract (or estimate) the target. The peak performance and optimal mask are explained in Fig. 1; the vertical and horizontal axes indicate the closeness of the BF output to the target and mask values, respectively. Although mask values vary multidimensionally, this figure conceptually represents the variation as a single axis. The extraction performance depends on this variation and exhibits a peak at a particular mask value. We refer to this as the optimal mask. As mentioned in Section 1, the optimal mask differs for each BF even inputting the same observations.

### 2.2 Signal models

This study considers that all signals are in the TF domain. The frequency index is omitted for simplicity, whereas the frame index t is always described. Let  $\boldsymbol{x}(t) = [x_1(t), \ldots, x_N(t)]^{\mathrm{T}}$  be an observation vector obtained with N microphones. The observation  $\boldsymbol{x}(t)$  can be expressed as the following mixture:

$$\boldsymbol{x}(t) = \boldsymbol{s}(t) + \boldsymbol{n}(t), \tag{1}$$

where  $\mathbf{s}(t) = [s_1(1), \ldots, s_N(t)]^{\mathrm{T}}$  denotes the components arriving from the target source and  $\mathbf{n}(t) = [n_1(1), \ldots, n_N(t)]^{\mathrm{T}}$  represents the residuals called interferences. Using the observation  $\mathbf{x}(t)$  and extraction filter  $\mathbf{w}$ , the estimated target y(t) is expressed as

$$y(t) = \boldsymbol{w}^{\mathrm{H}}\boldsymbol{x}(t). \tag{2}$$

Several BF types require scaling y(t) as a post-process. The scaling process can be represented as

$$z(t) = \gamma y(t), \tag{3}$$

where z(t) and  $\gamma$  are referred to as the *BF output* and *scaling factor*, respectively. To estimate  $\boldsymbol{w}$ , we define the following covariance matrices:

s contraite w, we define the following covariance matrices.

$$\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{\mathrm{x}} = \left\langle \boldsymbol{x}(t)\boldsymbol{x}(t)^{\mathrm{H}} \right\rangle_{t}, \qquad (4)$$

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{s} = \left\langle m_{s}(t)\boldsymbol{x}(t)\boldsymbol{x}(t)^{H} \right\rangle_{t}, \qquad (5)$$

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{n} = \left\langle m_{n}(t)\boldsymbol{x}(t)\boldsymbol{x}(t)^{H} \right\rangle_{t}, \qquad (6)$$

where  $m_{\rm s}(t)$  and  $m_{\rm n}(t)$  denote TF masks for the target and interferences, respectively, and  $\langle \cdot \rangle_t$  computes the average over t. We refer to  $\Phi_{\rm x}$ ,  $\hat{\Phi}_{\rm s}$ , and  $\hat{\Phi}_{\rm n}$  as observation, target, and interference covariance matrices, respectively. Unlike  $\Phi_{\rm x}$ , both  $\hat{\Phi}_{\rm s}$  and  $\hat{\Phi}_{\rm n}$ are estimated matrices computed from the masks and observations without using s(t)and n(t).

We consider that the optimal mask is the solution to the following minimization problem:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{filt}} = \underset{\mathcal{M}_{\text{filt}}}{\arg\min} \left\langle \left| s_k(t) - z(t) \right|^2 \right\rangle_t, \tag{7}$$

where k is the reference microphone index, and  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{filt}}$  denotes a set of mask values that comprises  $m_{\text{s}}(t)$ ,  $m_{\text{n}}(t)$ , or both for all t, depending on the BF employed. In principle,  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{filt}}$  cannot be obtained as the closed-form solution because the masks are indirectly used to estimate  $\boldsymbol{w}$  in (2).

We refer to the eigenvectors corresponding to the maximum and minimum eigenvalues simply as the *maximum* and *minimum* eigenvectors, respectively. Then, consider  $\text{GEV}_{\text{max}}(\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{B})$  and  $\text{GEV}_{\min}(\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{B})$  to be the maximum and minimum eigenvectors in the GEV problem represented as (8), respectively. Similarly, consider  $\text{SEV}_{\max}(\boldsymbol{A})$  to be the maximum eigenvector in the standard eigenvector (SEV) problem represented as (9).

$$Aw = \lambda Bw \tag{8}$$

$$\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{w} = \lambda \boldsymbol{w} \tag{9}$$

#### 2.3 Max-SNR BF

The max-SNR BF group consists of six variations including the original one. The derivation of all variations is subsequently explained because the same technique can be employed to enumerate all possible variations of the mask-based BFs.

The max-SNR BF is formulated as the following maximization problem [6, 7]:

$$\boldsymbol{w} = \operatorname*{arg\,max}_{\boldsymbol{w}} \frac{\boldsymbol{w}^{\mathrm{H}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\mathrm{s}} \boldsymbol{w}}{\boldsymbol{w}^{\mathrm{H}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\mathrm{n}} \boldsymbol{w}}$$
(10)

$$= \operatorname{GEV}_{\max}\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\mathrm{s}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\mathrm{n}}\right).$$
(11)

Considering that both the numerator and denominator in (10) are nonnegative, (10) is equivalent to (12). Thus, we can obtain a variation called the minimum noise-to-signal ratio (min-NSR) BF represented as (13).

$$\boldsymbol{w} = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{\boldsymbol{w}} \frac{\boldsymbol{w}^{\mathrm{H}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\mathrm{n}} \boldsymbol{w}}{\boldsymbol{w}^{\mathrm{H}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\mathrm{s}} \boldsymbol{w}}$$
(12)

$$= \operatorname{GEV}_{\min}\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{n}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{s}\right).$$
(13)

Both the max-SNR and min-NSR BFs use two masks. To derive the remaining variations that use a single mask, we assume the following relationship:

$$\hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}_{s} + \hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}_{n} = \mathbf{\Phi}_{x}.$$
(14)

This can eliminate  $\hat{\Phi}_s$  in (10) to derive (15) and (16), referred to as the maximum observation-to-noise ratio (max-ONR) BF [23]:

$$\boldsymbol{w} = \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{w}} \frac{\boldsymbol{w}^{\mathrm{H}} \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{\mathrm{x}} \boldsymbol{w}}{\boldsymbol{w}^{\mathrm{H}} \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{\mathrm{n}} \boldsymbol{w}}$$
(15)

$$= \operatorname{GEV}_{\max}\left(\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{\mathrm{x}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\mathrm{n}}\right).$$
(16)

Employing the equivalence between (15) and (17), we can derive (18) referred to as the minimum noise-to-observation ratio (min-NOR) BF [18, 20]:

$$\boldsymbol{w} = \underset{\boldsymbol{w}}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} \frac{\boldsymbol{w}^{\mathrm{H}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\mathrm{n}} \boldsymbol{w}}{\boldsymbol{w}^{\mathrm{H}} \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{\mathrm{x}} \boldsymbol{w}}$$
(17)

$$= \operatorname{GEV}_{\min}\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{n}, \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{x}\right).$$
(18)

Similarly, eliminating  $\hat{\Phi}_n$  in (12) derives both (20) and (22), referred to as the minimum observation-to-signal ratio (min-OSR) and maximum signal-to-observation ratio (max-SOR) BFs [18], respectively:

$$\boldsymbol{w} = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{\boldsymbol{w}} \frac{\boldsymbol{w}^{\mathrm{H}} \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{\mathrm{x}} \boldsymbol{w}}{\boldsymbol{w}^{\mathrm{H}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\mathrm{s}} \boldsymbol{w}} \tag{19}$$

$$= \operatorname{GEV}_{\min} \left( \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\mathbf{s}} \right), \tag{20}$$

$$\boldsymbol{w} = \operatorname*{arg\,max}_{\boldsymbol{w}} \frac{\boldsymbol{w}^{\mathrm{H}} \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{\mathrm{s}} \boldsymbol{w}}{\boldsymbol{w}^{\mathrm{H}} \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{\mathrm{x}} \boldsymbol{w}}$$
(21)

$$= \operatorname{GEV}_{\max}\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\mathrm{s}}, \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{\mathrm{x}}\right).$$
(22)

Constraints on the two masks included in  $\hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}_{s}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}_{n}$  are considered. Given that both the numerator and denominator in (10) need to be nonnegative, both  $m_{s}(t)$  and  $m_{n}(t)$  also need to be nonnegative.

Comparing (11), (16), and (22) reminds us that (16) and (22) can formally be obtained by replacing either  $\hat{\Phi}_s$  or  $\hat{\Phi}_n$  in (11) with  $\Phi_x$ . The same technique applies to obtaining (18) and (20) from (13). Although six variations are included in this type, we only need to examine three because (13), (18), and (20) are equivalent to (11), (16), and (22), respectively.

Our previous study [18] examined the max-SNR, min-NOR, and max-SOR BFs, corresponding to (11), (18), and (22), respectively, and reported that the optimal masks for the max-SNR BF are not optimal for the other two, because the masks do not satisfy (14) in fact; nevertheless, the three BFs can achieve the same extraction performance comparable with the upper bound. Additionally, independent of (14), the max-SOR BF can always be converted to the min-NOR BF by applying the following mask conversion rule:

$$m_{\rm n}(t) = d_{\rm s} - m_{\rm s}(t), \qquad (23)$$

where  $d_s$  denotes positive values such that  $m_n(t) \ge 0$  for all t. Similarly, the reversedirection conversion is always possible by applying the following rule:

$$m_{\rm s}(t) = d_{\rm n} - m_{\rm n}(t), \qquad (24)$$

where  $d_n$  denotes positive values such that  $m_s(t) \ge 0$  for all t. Previously, we employed the maximum values of  $m_s(t)$  and  $m_n(t)$  over t as  $d_s$  and  $d_n$ , respectively.

The formulas for this BF type cannot determine the norm of  $\boldsymbol{w}$ , namely the scale of the BF output [6]. Thus, a post-process for adjusting the scale referred to as *scaling* or *post-filtering* is required. The blind analytical normalization (BAN) [23] is extensively employed [6, 24, 25]. This method is represented as

$$\gamma = \frac{\sqrt{\boldsymbol{w}^{\mathrm{H}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\mathrm{n}} \boldsymbol{\hat{\Phi}}_{\mathrm{n}} \boldsymbol{w}/N}}{\boldsymbol{w}^{\mathrm{H}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\mathrm{n}} \boldsymbol{w}}.$$
(25)

Note that the BAN does not apply to BFs not using  $\hat{\Phi}_n$ , considering that (14) is not always satisfied.

#### 2.4 MMSE BF

The MMSE BF is formulated as a problem of minimizing the MSE between y(t) and the given reference q(t) [15, 26]:

$$\boldsymbol{w} = \underset{\boldsymbol{w}}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} \left\langle |q(t) - y(t)|^2 \right\rangle_t \tag{26}$$

$$= \Phi_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1} \left\langle \boldsymbol{x}(t) \overline{\boldsymbol{q}(t)} \right\rangle_{t}, \qquad (27)$$

where  $\overline{q(t)}$  denotes the conjugate of q(t). In this study, we do not assume that q(t) and  $\boldsymbol{n}(t)$  are uncorrelated because q(t) differs from  $s_k(t)$ . The mask-based MMSE BF employs the masked observation, which is  $m_s(t)x_k(t)$ , as the reference; thus,  $\boldsymbol{w}$  can be obtained as

$$\boldsymbol{w} = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{\boldsymbol{w}} \left\langle |m_{\mathrm{s}}(t)x_{k}(t) - y(t)|^{2} \right\rangle_{t}$$
(28)

$$= \mathbf{\Phi}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}_{\mathbf{s}} \boldsymbol{e}_{k}, \tag{29}$$

where  $e_k$  denotes the reference microphone index and one-hot vector in which the only kth element is one whereas the others are zero, respectively.

Another specialized MMSE BF is the ideal MMSE BF [26], which can achieve the theoretical upper-bound extraction performance for all BFs by minimizing the MSE between y(t) and the target; when s(t) in (1) is known, the ideal filter can be obtained using an element of s(t) as the ideal reference:

$$\boldsymbol{w}_{\text{ideal}} = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{\boldsymbol{w}} \left\langle \left| s_k(t) - y(t) \right|^2 \right\rangle_t \tag{30}$$

$$= \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1} \left\langle \boldsymbol{x}(t) \boldsymbol{s}(t)^{\mathrm{H}} \right\rangle_{t} \boldsymbol{e}_{k}.$$
(31)

The MMSE BF does not require the post-process for scaling, because (26) can determine the scale of y(t) and w. This also indicates that the MMSE BF output is sensitive to the scale of q(t) and the range of the mask values.

Unlike the max-SNR BF, the formulation of the mask-based MMSE BF represented as (28) allows  $m_s(t)$  to be any complex value. Thus, the ideal MMSE BF can be interpreted as a particular case in (28), that is,  $m_s(t) = s_k(t)/x_k(t)$ . However, we previously found that even if the mask values are constrained as non-negative ones, the MMSE BF is comparable with the ideal MMSE BF in terms of extraction performance although (28) cannot be identical to (30) in this case.

#### 2.5 MVDR BF

The MVDR BF group consists of three variations. The minimum power distortionless response (MPDR) BF [27] is included in this group.

The MPDR BF is formulated as the following minimization problem:

$$\boldsymbol{w} = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{\boldsymbol{w}} \left\langle \left| y(t) \right|^2 \right\rangle_t \tag{32}$$

s.t. 
$$\boldsymbol{w}^{\mathrm{H}}\boldsymbol{h} = 1$$
 (33)

$$=\frac{\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1}\boldsymbol{h}}{\boldsymbol{h}^{\mathrm{H}}\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1}\boldsymbol{h}},\tag{34}$$

where h denotes the steering vector (SV) corresponding to the target sound direction. The SV can be computed as the maximum eigenvector of  $\hat{\Phi}_{s}$  [7, 24]:

$$\boldsymbol{h} = \text{SEV}_{\text{max}} \left( \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\text{s}} \right). \tag{35}$$

If h is inaccurately associated with the target direction, the MPDR BF may suffer from the problem that the target is cancelled [27]. In contrast, the MVDR can avoid the problem by employing  $\hat{\Phi}_n$  instead of  $\Phi_x$  in (34) [7, 27]:

$$\boldsymbol{w} = \frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{n}^{-1}\boldsymbol{h}}{\boldsymbol{h}^{\mathrm{H}}\hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{n}^{-1}\boldsymbol{h}}.$$
(36)

Considering that (35) does not determine the norm of h, the scale of the estimated target y(t) is also ambiguous. Therefore, the mask-based MVDR BF requires a post-process for scaling, such as the single-channel Wiener filter (SWF) [28] and Kalman filter [29].

A significant variation of the MVDR that does not employ an SV was proposed in [10], referred to as the *Souden MVDR*. This estimates projections of y(t) to each microphone. The extraction filter for kth microphone can be obtained as

$$\boldsymbol{w} = \frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{n}^{-1}\hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{s}\boldsymbol{e}_{k}}{\operatorname{tr}\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{n}^{-1}\hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{s}\right)},\tag{37}$$

where  $tr(\cdot)$  calculates the trace of the given matrix. This BF can determine the scale of both  $\boldsymbol{w}$  and y(t) without any post-process.

We consider constraints on the two masks. The formulations of the three variations impose no constraint on  $m_{\rm s}(t)$ , whereas  $m_{\rm n}(t)$  must be non-negative, given that (36) can be interpreted as (38) constrained with (33), which is the problem of minimizing a weighted variance that needs to be non-negative.

$$\boldsymbol{w} = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{\boldsymbol{w}} \left\langle m_{\mathrm{n}}(t) \left| y(t) \right|^{2} \right\rangle_{t}.$$
(38)

Note that the optimal masks for the three variations are not evident because (34), (36), and (37) cannot be identical to (31) for any mask values.

#### 2.6 Mask types used in conventional mask-based BFs

We overview the mask types employed for the mask-based BFs. Considering the constraints on the mask values, we classify the types into four categories illustrated in Fig. 2. The complex-valued mask is the least constrained and can contain any complex numbers. Restricting the phase angle of the mask to 0 generates the non-negative mask. The ratio mask is more constrained because its values range between 0 and 1. The binary mask is the most constrained because its values are 0 or 1.

Investigating studies that employ DNNs to estimate masks for the BFs, we found that the following data need to be distinguished, although they can all be called masks:



Fig. 2 Mask type categorization based on the mask value constraint

- Supervisory data used for training the mask-estimating DNNs
- DNN outputs
- Weights used for computing weighted covariance matrices such as  $\hat{\Phi}_s$  and  $\hat{\Phi}_n$ .

Note that the DNN outputs are not necessarily equal to the weights for the covariance matrices.

Table 1 shows the mask types used in these studies. In [6], the DNN was trained to output two ratio masks, employing the two ideal binary masks for the target and interferences as the supervisory data. The DNN outputs were two ratio masks directly used as  $m_{\rm s}(t)$  and  $m_{\rm n}(t)$  in (5) and (6), respectively. In [8], the DNN was trained to output a single ratio mask for the target, using the target magnitude spectrogram as supervisory data. The DNN output was used as  $m_{\rm s}(t)$  in (5), while  $m_{\rm n}(t)$  was prepared by calculating  $m_{\rm n}(t) = 1 - m_{\rm s}(t)$ .

In [13], the DNN output was a ratio mask interpreted as a speech presence probability (SPP), which was used as  $m_{\rm s}(t)$ . Another ratio mask interpreted as a noise presence probability (NPP) was calculated as  $m_{\rm n}(t) = 1 - m_{\rm s}(t)$ .

Both [30] and [31] employed DNNs that output two complex-valued masks corresponding to the target and interferences. As a common characteristic, the DNNs were jointly trained with downstream tasks such as the BF and acoustic model for ASR; thus, no supervisory data were employed for the mask-estimating DNNs. Moreover, the DNN outputs, namely complex-valued masks, were converted to non-negative values to compute  $\hat{\Phi}_s$  and  $\hat{\Phi}_n$ ; in [30], both SPP and NPP were calculated from the masks, whereas in [31], the squared absolute values of the masks were used.

Overviewing the mask types, we found that the ratio masks are chiefly employed as the weights for computing  $\hat{\Phi}_s$  and  $\hat{\Phi}_n$ .

 Table 1
 Mask types used in mask-based BFs (SPP: speech presence probability, NPP: noise presence probability, JT: joint training, AM: acoustic model)

	Supervisory data	DNN outputs	Weights for $\hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}_{\mathrm{s}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}_{\mathrm{n}}$
Heymann+15 [6]	Binary	Ratio	Ratio
Erdogan+16 [8]	Other (target magni- tude spectrogram)	Ratio	Ratio
Pfeifenberger+17 [13]	Ratio (SPP)	Ratio (SPP)	Ratio (SPP and NPP)
Xu+19 [30]	n/a (JT with BF and AM)	Complex	Ratio (SPP and NPP)
Nguyen+22 [31]	n/a (JT with BF)	Complex	Non-negative (squared mag- nitudes of DNN outputs)

### **3** ICA-based TSE methods

This section describes the ICA-based TSE methods. The ICA is a framework that blindly separates individual sources from their mixtures observed with multiple sensors, assuming that the sources are mutually independent [32]. The ICA theory has been applied to derive TSE methods such as the similarity-and-independenceaware BF (SIBF) [20, 33] and maximum likelihood distortionless response (MLDR) BF [21, 22, 34]. Recently, several studies in this field mentioned that the formulas derived are similar to ones used for the mask-based BFs [20–22] despite differences in formulation. A remarkable point is that they commonly discussed that a weighted covariance matrix computed from a target source model representing the target source distribution corresponds to the interference covariance matrix, denoted as  $\hat{\Phi}_n$  in this study, rather than the target covariance matrix  $\hat{\Phi}_s$ .

#### 3.1 SIBF

The SIBF is a method that extracts a source similar to a reference, which is an approximately estimated magnitude spectrogram of the target, leveraging not merely the mutual independence of the sources but also the dependence between the BF output and reference. This is formulated as the following minimization problem [20]:

$$\boldsymbol{w} = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{\boldsymbol{w}} \left\{ -\log \mathrm{P}\big(\boldsymbol{y}(t), \boldsymbol{r}(t)\big) \right\}$$
(39)

s.t. 
$$\left\langle \left| y(t) \right|^2 \right\rangle_t = 1,$$
 (40)

where a reference r(t) denotes the magnitude spectrogram, while P(y(t), r(t)) represents a joint probability density function between the BF output and reference, referred to as a target source model. The reference can be generated with various TSE methods including DNN-based ones. An instance of a source model is the time-frequency-varying variance (TV) Gaussian model [35] written as

$$P(y(t), r(t)) \propto \exp\left(-\frac{|y(t)|^2}{r(t)^{\beta}}\right),$$
(41)

where  $\beta$  denotes a hyperparameter that controls the influence of the reference. The extraction filter for this model can be obtained as

$$\boldsymbol{w} = \text{GEV}_{\min}\left(\left\langle \frac{\boldsymbol{x}(t)\boldsymbol{x}(t)^{\text{H}}}{r(t)^{\beta}} \right\rangle_{t}, \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{\text{x}}\right).$$
(42)

As discussed in [20], (42) corresponds to the min-NOR BF represented as (18), regarding  $1/r(t)^{\beta}$  as  $m_{\rm n}(t)$  in (6). While this mask is generally categorized as the non-negative mask illustrated in Fig. 2, it can also be considered as the ratio mask by

using the following correspondence:

$$m_{\rm n}(t) = \frac{\varepsilon}{\max\left(r(t)^{\beta}, \varepsilon\right)},$$
(43)

where  $\max(\cdot)$  and  $\varepsilon$  denote a function that chooses the greater one and a small positive value to prevent dividing by zero, respectively.

The SIBF involves the scale ambiguity problem that the scale of w cannot be determined similarly to the ICA [36]. Therefore, the scaling method based on the minimal distortion principle (MDP) [37], extensively adopted in the ICA field, was combined in [20]. This method calculates  $\gamma$  in (3) as follows:

$$\gamma = \arg\min_{\gamma} \left\langle |x_k(t) - \gamma y(t)|^2 \right\rangle_t, \tag{44}$$

$$=\frac{\left\langle x_{k}\overline{y(t)}\right\rangle_{t}}{\left\langle \left|y(t)\right|^{2}\right\rangle_{t}}.$$
(45)

Additionally, a technique of casting the SIBF output into the reference-estimating DNN was proposed in [20], referred to as *iterative casting*, to generate a more accurate reference and SIBF output. This technique also leads to the finding that the combination of the newer reference and the phase of the previous SIBF output tends to be more accurate than the newer SIBF output; in short, r(t)z'(t)/|z'(t)| is better than both z'(t) and z(t), where r(t) denotes the newer reference, while z'(t) and z(t) denotes the previous and newer SIBF outputs, respectively.

#### 3.2 MLDR BF

A similar discussion can be found in the studies on the MLDR BF [21, 22, 34]. This method estimates the extraction filter as follows:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\sigma} = \left\langle \frac{\boldsymbol{x}(t)\boldsymbol{x}(t)^{\mathrm{H}}}{\sigma(t)^{2}} \right\rangle_{t}, \qquad (46)$$

$$\boldsymbol{w} = \frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\sigma}^{-1}\boldsymbol{h}}{\boldsymbol{h}^{\mathrm{H}}\hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\sigma}^{-1}\boldsymbol{h}},\tag{47}$$

$$\sigma(t)^{2} = \left| \boldsymbol{w}^{\mathrm{H}} \boldsymbol{x}(t) \right|^{2}, \qquad (48)$$

where  $\sigma(t)^2$  denotes a TV of the target based on the TV Gaussian model. Given that  $\sigma(t)$  is also a parameter to be estimated,  $\boldsymbol{w}$  and  $\sigma(t)$  are alternatively computed by using (46) to (48). As a variation of the MLDR BF,  $\sigma(t)$  is employed as the denominator of (46) in [22], based on the TV Laplacian model.

Comparing (47) and (36), the MLDR BF can correspond to the MVDR BF, regarding  $1/\sigma(t)^2$  as  $m_n(t)$ . Similarly,  $1/\sigma(t)$  can be regarded as  $m_n(t)$  in [22]. In both cases,  $m_n(t)$  can be interpreted as a non-negative mask corresponding to not the interferences but the target.



Fig. 3 Unified framework of mask-based BFs (proposed)

Similar to the MVDR BF, the scale of w is ambiguous if h is estimated with the SEV. Thus, the same techniques apply to the scaling.

## 4 Unified framework of mask-based BFs

In this study, we propose a unified framework of the mask-based BFs that addresses the coverage and scaling issues mentioned in Section 1. The framework comprises two processes: filter estimation and scaling as illustrated in Fig. 3; the former process estimates an extraction filter and applies this to the observations to generate the estimated target; the latter process adjusts the scale of the BF output using a scaling reference. A characteristic of the framework is that both processes are mask-based; the filter estimation process employs one or two masks, corresponding to  $m_s(t)$ ,  $m_n(t)$ , or both, depending on the variation used; the scaling process adopts an alternative mask  $m_p(t)$ , called a *scaling mask*, to generate the scaling reference.

The framework is explained in the subsequent subsections. In 4.1, we consider how the filter estimation process can cover all possible variations. In 4.2, we propose the mask-based scaling process that can be combined with any BF variations. In 4.3, we examine proper mask types for the processes.

#### 4.1 Filter estimation process covering all variations

In this study, the filter estimation process needs to cover all BF variations to explore their peak extraction performance. Thus, inspired by the derivation steps described in **2.3**, we propose a methodology to enumerate all the possible variations represented as combinations among existing mask-based BFs. This consists of the following steps:

1. Focus on BF methods that employ two masks, including the max-SNR, min-NSR, MVDR, and Souden MVDR BFs, as representatives of each BF type.

- 2. Eliminate any scalar factors that adjust the filter scale, given that this is estimated in the subsequent process.
- 3. Replace either  $\hat{\Phi}_s$  or  $\hat{\Phi}_n$  with  $\Phi_x$  to obtain two variations that use a single mask.
- 4. Name each variation systematically as shown in Table 2; a variation name consists of the prefix (type name) and suffix that reflect the operators and covariance matrices included in the formula, respectively.

The methodology allows us to derive 12 variations shown in Table 3 as all the possible ones. Subsequently, we explain each of the variations.

First, we focus on max-SNR BF represented as (11). According to Table 2, we refer to this as MaxGEV-NS BF. As mentioned in 2.3, replacing  $\hat{\Phi}_n$  and  $\hat{\Phi}_s$  with  $\Phi_x$  in (11) derives max-SOR and max-ONR BFs, respectively. We also rename them as MaxGEV-OS and NO BFs. Similarly, we focus on min-NSR BF represented as (13) and refer to this as MinGEV-NS BF. Its two variations, min-OSR and NOR BFs are

Table 2 Prefixes (type names) and suffixes of variation names

	Name	Meaning
Prefix	MaxGEV MinGEV INV ISEV	<u>Max</u> imum eigenvector in generalized <u>eigenvalue</u> decomposition <u>Min</u> imum eigenvector in generalized <u>eigenvalue</u> decomposition Matrix <u>inv</u> ersion Matrix <u>inv</u> ersion and <u>standard</u> <u>eigenvalue</u> decomposition
Suffix	NS OS NO	$egin{array}{lll} \hat{m{\Phi}}_{n} \mbox{ and } \hat{m{\Phi}}_{s} \ m{\Phi}_{x} \mbox{ and } \hat{m{\Phi}}_{s} \ m{\hat{\Phi}}_{n} \mbox{ and } m{\Phi}_{x} \end{array}$

Table 3 All possible variations of mask-based BFs and corresponding conventional methods

Variation name	Filter estimation	Masks	Corresponding methods
MaxGEV-NS	$oldsymbol{w} =  ext{GEV}_{ ext{max}}\left(\hat{oldsymbol{\Phi}}_{ ext{s}}, \hat{oldsymbol{\Phi}}_{ ext{n}} ight)$	$m_{ m n}(t), m_{ m s}(t)$	Max-SNR
MaxGEV-OS	$oldsymbol{w} = \operatorname{GEV}_{\max}\left(\hat{oldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\mathrm{s}}, oldsymbol{\Phi}_{\mathrm{s}} ight)$	$m_{ m s}(t)$	Max-SOR
MaxGEV-NO	$oldsymbol{w} =  ext{GEV}_{ ext{max}}\left(oldsymbol{\Phi}_{ ext{x}}, \hat{oldsymbol{\Phi}}_{ ext{n}} ight)$	$m_{ m n}(t)$	Max-ONR
MinGEV-NS	$oldsymbol{w} =  ext{GEV}_{ ext{min}}\left(\hat{oldsymbol{\Phi}}_{ ext{n}}, \hat{oldsymbol{\Phi}}_{ ext{s}} ight)$	$m_{ m n}(t), m_{ m s}(t)$	Min-NSR
MinGEV-OS	$oldsymbol{w} =  ext{GEV}_{ ext{min}} \left( oldsymbol{\Phi}_{ ext{x}}, \hat{oldsymbol{\Phi}}_{ ext{s}}  ight)$	$m_{ m s}(t)$	Min-OSR
MinGEV-NO	$oldsymbol{w} = \operatorname{GEV}_{\min}\left(\hat{oldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\mathrm{n}}, oldsymbol{\Phi}_{\mathrm{x}} ight)$	$m_{ m n}(t)$	Min-NOR, SIBF
INV-NS	$oldsymbol{w}=\hat{oldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\mathrm{n}}^{-1}\hat{oldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\mathrm{s}}oldsymbol{e}_{k}$	$m_{\rm n}(t), m_{\rm s}(t)$	Souden MVDR
INV-OS INV-NO	$oldsymbol{w} = oldsymbol{\Phi}_{\mathrm{x}}  oldsymbol{\Phi}_{\mathrm{s}} oldsymbol{e}_k \ oldsymbol{w} = \hat{oldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\mathrm{n}}^{-1} oldsymbol{\Phi}_{\mathrm{x}} oldsymbol{e}_k$	$m_{ m s}(t) \ m_{ m n}(t)$	MMSE
ISEV-NS	$oldsymbol{w} = \hat{oldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\mathrm{n}}^{-1} \mathrm{SEV}_{\mathrm{max}} \left( \hat{oldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\mathrm{s}}  ight)$	$m_{ m n}(t),m_{ m s}(t)$	MVDR, MLDR
ISEV-OS	$oldsymbol{w} = oldsymbol{\Phi}_{\mathrm{x}}^{-1} \mathrm{SEV}_{\mathrm{max}} \left( \hat{oldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\mathrm{s}}  ight)$	$m_{ m s}(t)$	MPDR
ISEV-NO	$oldsymbol{w} = \hat{oldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\mathrm{n}}^{-1} \mathrm{SEV}_{\mathrm{max}} \left( oldsymbol{\Phi}_{\mathrm{x}}  ight)^{\prime}$	$m_{ m n}(t)$	

renamed MinGEV-OS and NO BFs, respectively. As mentioned in **3.1**, MinGEV-NO BF also corresponds to SIBF, despite different formulations.

Next, the methodology is applied to Souden MVDR BF represented as (37). As illustrated in Fig. 3, the estimated target is to be scaled after computing w. Therefore, the denominator in (37) can be omitted as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{w} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\mathrm{n}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\mathrm{s}} \boldsymbol{e}_k. \tag{49}$$

According to Table 2, we refer to this as INV-NS BF. Comparing (49) and (29), MMSE BF can be derived by replacing  $\hat{\Phi}_n$  in (49) with  $\Phi_x$ . Thus, this is called INV-OS BF.

The methodology can derive a variation that has not been used as a BF. Replacing  $\hat{\Phi}_n$  in (49) with  $\Phi_x$  leads to the following formula referred to as INV-NO BF:

$$\boldsymbol{w} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{n}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{x} \boldsymbol{e}_{k}. \tag{50}$$

Finally, the methodology is applied to MVDR BF represented as (36). We can combine (35) and (36), omitting the denominator in (36), to rewrite them as

$$\boldsymbol{w} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{n}^{-1} SEV_{max} \left( \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{s} \right).$$
 (51)

This is called ISEV-NS BF according to Table 2. As mentioned in **3.2**, this also corresponds to MLDR BF. Replacing  $\hat{\Phi}_n$  in (51) with  $\Phi_x$  leads to

$$\boldsymbol{w} = \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{\mathrm{x}}^{-1} \mathrm{SEV}_{\mathrm{max}} \left( \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\mathrm{s}} \right).$$
 (52)

This corresponds to MPDR BF represented as (34) and is referred to as ISEV-OS BF. Similar to INV-NO BF, the following variations can also be derived:

$$\boldsymbol{w} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{n}^{-1} SEV_{max} \left( \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{x} \right).$$
(53)

This is referred to as ISEV-NO BF, although this has not been used as a BF.

Observing all the variations described in Table 3, we have several points to note. The MinGEV type is theoretically equivalent to the MaxGEV type as mentioned in **2.3**; thus, we only need to consider one. This study examines the MinGEV type to match the order of the covariance matrices in the formulas with other types. Therefore, the number of variations is practically nine. In contrast, the INV and ISEV types do not contain any equivalent pairs; variations ending with -OS and -NO cannot be derived mathematically even assuming (14). Moreover, given that (7) indicates a different minimization problem for each variation, the optimal mask for a variation differs from that for the others except for the equivalent pairs: those between the MaxGEV- and MinGEV-NO BFs, and between the MaxGEV- and MinGEV-OS BFs. Similarly, mask conversion rules represented as (23) and (24) do not apply except for these four variations.

#### 4.2 Mask-based scaling process

This study employs the unified scaling method for all the BF variations. We define the scaling process as approximating the target by multiplying y(t) by a scaling factor  $\gamma$  in (3). Ideal scaling (IS) can be achieved by directly minimizing the MSE between z(t) and an element of s(t) as follows:

$$\gamma_{\text{ideal}} = \arg\min_{\gamma} \left\langle \left| s_k(t) - z(t) \right|^2 \right\rangle_t \tag{54}$$

$$=\frac{\left\langle s_{k}(t)\overline{y(t)}\right\rangle _{t}}{\left\langle \left|y(t)\right|^{2}\right\rangle _{t}}.$$
(55)

However, IS does not apply to realistic scenarios because  $s_k(t)$  is unavailable. Therefore, an alternative method needs to satisfy the following respects: 1) applicable to the realistic scenarios, 2) comparable with the IS, and 3) independent of the BF variation used.

In this study, we propose mask-based scaling formulated as follows:

$$p(t) = m_{\rm p}(t)x_k(t),\tag{56}$$

$$\gamma = \arg\min_{\gamma} \left\langle \left| p(t) - z(t) \right|^2 \right\rangle_t, \tag{57}$$

$$=\frac{\left\langle p(t)\overline{y(t)}\right\rangle_{t}}{\left\langle |y(t)|^{2}\right\rangle_{t}},\tag{58}$$

where p(t) and  $m_{\rm p}(t)$  denote a scaling reference and scaling mask, respectively. Note that this method is linear processing different from the post-masking that calculates  $z(t) = m_{\rm p}(t)y(t)$  [8, 28, 38]. The mask-based scaling method includes both IS and MDP as particular cases:  $p(t) = s_k(t)$  and  $p(t) = x_k(t)$  in (57), that is,  $m_{\rm p}(t) = s_k(t)/x_k(t)$  and  $m_{\rm p}(t) = 1$  in (56), respectively.

Similar to the optimal mask for the filter estimation represented as (7), we consider that the optimal scaling mask is the solution to the following minimization problem:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\rm p} = \underset{\mathcal{M}_{\rm p}}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} \left\langle \left| s_k(t) - z(t) \right|^2 \right\rangle_t,\tag{59}$$

where  $\mathcal{M}_{\rm p}$  denotes a set of  $m_{\rm p}(t)$  over all frames. If  $m_{\rm p}(t)$  is categorized as the complexvalued mask illustrated in Fig. 2, the optimal mask is  $m_{\rm p}(t) = s_k(t)/x_k(t)$  because this can behave as the IS represented as (54). However, if  $m_{\rm p}(t)$  is constrained to the nonnegative mask, the optimal one is not evident. Moreover, considering that the scale of  $m_{\rm p}(t)$  affects  $\gamma$ , a more constrained mask may degrade extraction performance due to inaccurate scaling. Therefore, we experimentally explore an appropriate mask type.

Additionally, the relationship between mask-based scaling and MMSE BF is considered. When both methods are combined, that is, (2) and (27) are applied to (58),

 $\gamma$  is represented as

$$\gamma = \frac{\boldsymbol{e}_{k}^{\mathrm{H}} \left\langle m_{\mathrm{p}}(t) \boldsymbol{x}(t) \boldsymbol{x}(t)^{\mathrm{H}} \right\rangle_{t} \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{\mathrm{x}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\mathrm{s}} \boldsymbol{e}_{k}}{\boldsymbol{e}_{k}^{\mathrm{H}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\mathrm{s}} \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{\mathrm{x}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{\mathrm{s}} \boldsymbol{e}_{k}}.$$
(60)

The case  $m_{\rm p}(t) = m_{\rm s}(t)$  for all t results in  $\gamma = 1$ . This fact indicates that maskbased MMSE BF involves the effect of mask-based scaling if  $m_{\rm s}(t) = m_{\rm p}(t)$ . Similarly, the ideal MMSE BF includes the effect of IS because both correspond to the case  $m_{\rm p}(t) = m_{\rm s}(t) = s_k(t)/x_k(t)$ .

#### 4.3 Proper mask types for the framework

A key issue in the unified framework is determining the appropriate mask type for  $m_{\rm s}(t)$ ,  $m_{\rm n}(t)$ , and  $m_{\rm p}(t)$ . We address this issue from three perspectives, as shown in Table 4.

1. Constraints in DNN training. Although this study does not include DNN training, it is important to consider this aspect because mask values are typically estimated using DNNs in real scenarios. More constrained supervisory data can lead to more efficient training by integrating these constraints into the DNN structure, including the output-layer activation function [39]. For example, when training with ratio masks, using a sigmoid function in the output layer can enhance training efficiency [8, 40]. Similarly, for non-negative data, incorporating an activation function that outputs non-negative values can improve training efficiency [39, 41]. In summary, complex-valued masks are unnecessary if non-negative and ratio masks can achieve the theoretical upper-bound performance, as no constraints can be applied to training with complex-valued masks.

2. Filter estimation. As discussed in Section 2, different BFs require different constraints on the masks used for filter estimation. However, to compare all BF variations under unified conditions, the framework uses ratio masks for several reasons. For the MaxGEV and MinGEV types, masks must be non-negative because they derive from the max-SNR BF, as explained in Section 2.3. Ratio masks are used because the range of mask values does not affect the eigenvectors in (8). For the INV and ISEV types,  $m_{\rm s}(t)$  can take any complex value, whereas  $m_{\rm n}(t)$  is constrained to non-negative values, as described in 2.4 and 2.5. We standardize the masks for these types to ratio

Process	Variation type	Mask	Theoretically required	Examined in this study
Filter estimation	MaxGEV, MinGEV	$m_{ m s}(t) \ m_{ m n}(t)$	Non-negative Non-negative	Ratio Ratio
	INV, ISEV	$m_{ m s}(t) \ m_{ m n}(t)$	Complex Non-negative	Ratio Ratio
Scaling		$m_{\rm p}(t)$	Complex	Non-negative, Ratio

Table 4 Mask types used in this study

masks to maintain consistency with the MaxGEV and MinGEV types. The distinction between non-negative and ratio masks mainly affects the scale of  $\boldsymbol{w}$  which can be adjusted during scaling. Our focus is on whether the constraint on  $m_{\rm s}(t)$  impacts the peak extraction performance for INV and ISEV variations.

3. Scaling. Both (56) and (58) indicate that the scale of  $m_{\rm p}(t)$  influences the BF output. Therefore, we need to examine both the non-negative and ratio masks. Additionally, based on the first perspective, a complex-valued mask is not required if a non-negative mask can achieve the theoretical upper-bound performance.

## 5 Experiments

To explore the peak extraction performance for all variations described in Table 3 and verify whether the mask-based scaling is comparable with the IS, we conducted a series of experiments using the unified framework. Considering that the framework consists of two processes, filter estimation and scaling, experiments were conducted as follows:

- 1. Comparing all BF variations employing the IS,
- Comparing four scaling methods: mask-based scaling using non-negative and ratio masks, as well as IS and MDP.
- 3. Jointly optimizing each variation and the non-negative-mask-based scaling.

The setups for each experiment are shown in Table 5, explained later.

In the subsequent subsections, we describe the dataset and common setups used in the experiments and demonstrate the experimental results in order.

#### 5.1 Dataset and common setups

We employed both the development and test sets included in the CHiME-4 simulated dataset [42]. The same data were included in the CHiME-3 dataset [19]. The development set contained 410 utterances from four speakers (1640 utterances in total) and four background (BG) noises. The sound data of this dataset was recorded at 16 kHz by six microphones attached to a tablet device. We generated the TF domain signals using short-time Fourier transform with window and shift lengths of 1024 and 256, respectively. To represent multiple scenarios in different SNRs, we artificially mixed

**Table 5** Experimental setups (FE: filter estimation; Dev.: development set; 4 metrics: SDR,PESQ, STOI, and eSTOI)

Section	Dataset	g	$\mathbf{FE}$	Scaling	Metric	Iter	ation
						FE	Scaling
5.2	Dev.	1, 2, 4	12 variations	IS	SDR	500	-
5.3	Dev.	1, 2, 4	Ideal MMSE	Non-negative, Ratio, IS, MDP	SDR	-	500
5.4	Dev. Test	1, 2, 4 1	9 variations 9 variations	Non-negative Non-negative	SDR 4 metrics	500 ( 500 (	joint) joint)
Appendix A	Dev.	1	9 variations	IS	SDR	50–500	-



Fig. 4 Process of generating observation data for three noisy scenarios

the utterances and one of the background noises, applying three multipliers, g = 1.0, 2.0, and 4.0, to the BG noise as shown in Fig. 4. We refer to these values as *BG multipliers*. Each scenario comprises 1640 utterances and its SNR score is indicated in Table 6. These scenarios were used for all experiments. Experiment 3 also used the CHiME-4 test set, comprising 330 utterances from four speakers and four BG noises (1320 utterances in total).

All experiments used the SDR [43] as an evaluation metric, calculated as follows:

$$\text{SDR} [\text{dB}] = 10 \log_{10} \left( \frac{\left\langle |S_k(t)|^2 \right\rangle_t}{\left\langle |S_k(t) - Z(t)|^2 \right\rangle_t} \right), \tag{61}$$

where  $S_k(t)$  and Z(t) denote the waveforms corresponding to  $s_k(t)$  and z(t), respectively. Experiment 3 also used the narrowband perceptual evaluation of speech quality (PESQ) [44], short-time objective intelligibility measure (STOI) [45], and extended STOI (eSTOI) [46]. Basically, these four metrics show higher scores as the BF output approaches the target.

Considering that the microphone #5 was the closest to the speaker position as illustrated in Fig. 4, k was set to 5 as the reference microphone index. That is, k = 5 was used in all formuras in Table 3, and in (7), (31), (55), and (56). Similarly,  $S_5(t)$  was used as the reference signal for calculating the SDR, PESQ, STOI, and eSTOI scores.

All the systems employed in the experiments were implemented in PyTorch [47], which supports the backpropagation of matrix operations in the complex number domain.

Table 6 SNR [dB] for each scenario

Γ	Test		
g = 1.0	g = 2.0	g = 4.0	g = 1.0
5.79	-0.21	-6.12	7.54



Fig. 5 System used in Experiment 1: comparing all variations (BN: batch normalization, BP: back-propagation, MSE: mean square error)

#### 5.2 Experiment 1: Comparing the variations

First, we compared all the variations of the unified framework using the setups in the first row of Table 5. Fig. 5 illustrates the experimental system. The filter estimation process covered all 12 variations shown in Table 3, while the scaling process was fixed to the IS. One or two mask buffers were prepared depending on the variation used. We applied the sigmoid function to the buffered values to constrain the mask type to the ratio mask, as illustrated in Fig. 2. Since this function can be interpreted as an activation function in the output layer [39], we inserted a batch normalization (BN) layer [48] before applying the function to achieve faster convergence. This layer treated each frequency bin as a BN channel.

The optimal mask for each variation was obtained by minimizing the MSE between z(t) and  $s_k(t)$  on an utterance by utterance basis, as represented in (7). The BN layer was also optimized for each utterance. Based on preliminary experiments mentioned in Appendix A, 500 iterations were adopted for all variations, and BN was enabled except for the MaxGEV-NO, MaxGEV-OS, MinGEV-NO, and MinGEV-OS BFs. The ideal MMSE BF represented as (31) was also evaluated to determine the theoretical upper-bound performance of the BFs.

Table 7 shows SDR scores of all variations and the ideal MMSE BF for the three scenarios. Given that the maximum SDR difference in this table is only 0.02dB, we can regard that all variations achieved the same extraction performance comparable with the upper bound. Remarkably, both INV- and ISEV-NO BFs achieved the same performance although not employed as BFs.

We also confirmed that MaxGEV-NS, NO, and OS BFs achieved the same performance as MinGEV-NS, NO, and OS BFs, respectively because of the theoretical equivalence mentioned in 2.3 and 4.1. Therefore, we did not examine the MaxGEV type in subsequent experiments.

#### 5.3 Experiment 2: Comparing the scaling methods

Next, we compared the following scaling methods, using the setups in the second row of Table 5:

- 1. Mask-based scaling using a non-negative mask in (56)
- 2. Mask-based scaling using a ratio mask in (56)
- 3. IS represented as (55)
- 4. MDP represented as (45)

Fig. 6 illustrates the experimental system using the non-negative and ratio masks. The filter estimation process was fixed to the ideal MMSE BF represented as (31). The mask-based scaling process required a single mask buffer. We exclusively applied the absolute (Abs) and sigmoid functions to the buffered values to constrain the mask type to the non-negative and ratio masks, respectively. BN was enabled for the two functions.

The optimal scaling mask was iteratively obtained by minimizing the MSE represented in (59). Similar to the previous experiment, 500 iterations were adopted for sufficient convergence.

Table 8 presents the SDR score for each scaling method and scenario. The scores for the IS were identical to those of the ideal MMSE BF shown in Experiment 1 because the ideal MMSE BF inherently includes the effect of the IS, as mentioned in **4.2**. The scaling method using a non-negative mask achieved the same scores as the IS, whereas the method using a ratio mask produced scores comparable to the non-negative mask or slightly lower. In contrast, the MDP method showed a larger degradation in performance compared to the others.

Based on these results, we adopted the non-negative mask. Consequently, only the Abs function was used as the activation function for scaling in the subsequent experiments.

Variation name	BN	g = 1.0	g = 2.0	g = 4.0
MaxGEV-NS MaxGEV-NO MaxGEV-OS	~	17.91 17.91 17.91	$12.64 \\ 12.64 \\ 12.64$	$7.74 \\ 7.74 \\ 7.74 \\ 7.74$
MinGEV-NS MinGEV-NO MinGEV-OS	~	17.91 17.91 17.91	$12.64 \\ 12.64 \\ 12.64$	$7.74 \\ 7.74 \\ 7.74$
INV-NS INV-NO INV-OS	√ √ √	<b>17.92</b> <b>17.92</b> 17.91	<b>12.64</b> <b>12.64</b> 12.63	<b>7.74</b> <b>7.74</b> 7.73
ISEV-NS ISEV-NO ISEV-OS	$\checkmark$	<b>17.92</b> <b>17.92</b> 17.90	<b>12.64</b> <b>12.64</b> 12.62	<b>7.74</b> <b>7.74</b> 7.72
Ideal MMSE	n/a	17.92	12.64	7.74

Table 7SDR scores [dB] of all BF variations with ISin Experiment 1 (BN: batch normalization)



Fig. 6 System used in Experiment 2: Comparing the scaling methods (Abs: absolute function)



Fig. 7 Experiment 3: Joint optimization

#### 5.4 Experiment 3: Joint optimization

Next, we obtained optimal masks for both the filter estimation and scaling processes using the third row of Table 5. Fig. 7 illustrates the system used in this experiment. The filter estimation process was identical to that used in Experiment 1, and the scaling process was the same as that used in Experiment 2, except that the sigmoid function was excluded.

**Table 8** SDR scores [dB] on comparing the scaling methods in Experiment 2

Scaling method	Mask type	g = 1.0	g = 2.0	g = 4.0
Mask-based	Non-negative (Abs) Ratio (Sigmoid)	<b>17.92</b> 17.88	<b>12.64</b> 12.62	<b>7.74</b> 7.73
IS MDP	$\begin{array}{l} \text{Complex} \\ m_{\rm p}(t) = 1 \end{array}$	<b>17.92</b> 17.23	<b>12.64</b> 11.33	<b>7.74</b> 5.38

A set of optimal masks for both processes was obtained as the solution to the following minimization problem:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{filt}}, \mathcal{M}_{\text{p}} = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{filt}}, \mathcal{M}_{\text{p}}} \left\langle \left| s_k(t) - z(t) \right|^2 \right\rangle_t.$$
(62)

Similar to the previous experiments, 500 iterations were employed.

Table 9 presents the SDR scores for each variation and scenario. Due to the equivalence mentioned in 5.2, we consider that the scores of MaxGEV-NS, NO, and OS BFs are the same as those of MinGEV-NS, NO, and OS, respectively. Although MinGEV-OS demonstrated a slightly larger score than the ideal MMSE in the g = 4.0 scenario, attribute this to an error caused in calculating the SDR in the time domain as represented in (61). Therefore, similar to Experiment 1, we can regard all the variations as achieving the theoretical upper-bound performance obtained with the ideal MMSE BF. Additionally, the optimal masks for both filter estimation and scaling are illustrated in Appendix B; the optimal masks for filter estimation appear to be different for each variation despite achieving the same performance.

Finally, we evaluated the same system on the CHiME-4 test set to measure four metrics, SDR, PESQ, STOI, and eSTOI. The results are shown in Table 10. Given that the maximum difference was just 0.02 points for all the metrics, we can also regard that all the variations achieved the theoretical upper-bound performance in the test set and across the four metrics. The significance of these results is discussed in **6.3**.

### 6 Discussion

The experimental results suggest the following aspects:

- 1. All variations of the mask-based BFs using one or two ratio masks can achieve the theoretical upper-bound performance obtained with the ideal MMSE BF.
- 2. The scaling process using a non-negative mask can function as the IS.

Variation name	Equivalent to	g = 1.0	g = 2.0	g = 4.0
MinGEV-NS	MaxGEV-NS	17.91	$12.64 \\ 12.64 \\ 12.64$	7.74
MinGEV-NO	MaxGEV-NO	17.91		7.74
MinGEV-OS	MaxGEV-OS	17.91		<b>7.75</b>
INV-NS	-	17.91	<b>12.64</b>	7.74
INV-NO	-	17.91	<b>12.64</b>	7.74
INV-OS	-	17.91	12.63	7.73
ISEV-NS	-	$17.91 \\ 17.91 \\ 17.90$	<b>12.64</b>	7.74
ISEV-NO	-		<b>12.64</b>	7.74
ISEV-OS	-		12.62	7.72
Ideal MMSE	-	17.92	12.64	7.74

Table 9 SDR scores [dB] of the joint optimization in Experiment 3

3. Jointly optimizing the masks can also achieve the upper-bound performance. This trend is verified in the SDR, PESQ, STOI, and eSTOI scores using the CHiME-4 test set.

This section discusses these aspects in the subsequent subsections. Additionally, we explore why several variations that have not traditionally been employed as BFs can still effectively extract the target.

# 6.1 Why can all variations achieve the theoretical upper-bound performance?

The experimental results suggest that all 12 variations can achieve the theoretical upper-bound performance even when the mask type is constrained to a ratio mask. We first explain that these results do not contradict studies that compared multiple BFs and reported different ones as the best [7, 14–17]. Then we discuss the reason for achieving the same performance, using the concept of the practical parameter count and performance saturation point.

#### 6.1.1 Explanation of non-contradiction with previous studies

Fig. 8 conceptually illustrates that multiple BFs contain the same peak extraction performance. As mentioned in 4.1, the optimal mask differs for each BF. In the comparative studies [7, 14–17], multiple BFs, BFs 1 and 2, used the same mask and demonstrated different performance scores. Although BF 1 appears to outperform BF 2 in Fig. 8, this result does not contradict the fact the peak performance is the same as BF 2.

Another reason for the performance differences in these comparative studies is the inconsistent scaling methods employed. For example, in [7], the max-SNR BF was evaluated with BAN, while the MVDR BF was evaluated without scaling. Differences in scaling methods can significantly influence extraction performance even when the

Variation name	Equivalent to	SDR [dB]	PESQ	STOI [%]	eSTOI [%]
MinGEV-NS	MaxGEV-NS	<b>19.44</b>	$2.77 \\ 2.77 \\ 2.77 \\ 2.77$	97.03	90.48
MinGEV-NO	MaxGEV-NO	19.43		97.03	90.48
MinGEV-OS	MaxGEV-OS	19.42		97.03	90.48
INV-NS	-	<b>19.44</b>	$2.77 \\ 2.77 \\ 2.77 \\ 2.77$	97.03	<b>90.49</b>
INV-NO	-	<b>19.44</b>		97.03	90.48
INV-OS	-	19.43		97.03	90.48
ISEV-NS	-	<b>19.44</b>	$2.77 \\ 2.77 \\ 2.77 \\ 2.77$	97.03	<b>90.49</b>
ISEV-NO	-	<b>19.44</b>		97.03	90.48
ISEV-OS	-	19.43		97.03	90.48
Microphone #5	-	7.54	2.18	87.03	68.32
Ideal MMSE		<b>19.44</b>	<b>2.77</b>	<b>97.03</b>	90.49

Table 10 SDR [dB], PESQ, STOI [%], and eSTOI [%] scores using the CHiME-4 test set in Experiment 3



Fig. 8 Peak performance and optimal masks for two BFs

extraction filter is the same, as suggested in Experiment 2. Therefore, the scaling method needs to be unified for a fair comparison.

# 6.1.2 Concept of practical parameter count and performance saturation point

The concept of the bias-variance tradeoff [49] can account for the results that all variations achieved the same peak performance as the theoretical upper-bound performance. The tradeoff implies that a model with many parameters can reduce an error (bias) between the model output and the supervisory data, but may increase the error (variance) between the output and unseen data, and vice versa for a model with fewer parameters. Viewing (7) and (62), we can interpret that the mask-based BFs represent the problem of approximating the target (supervisory data) by employing one or two masks as a model parameter set. Given that the masks are optimized for each target in this study, we do not need to consider unseen data or increasing variance.

The mask type categorization illustrated in Fig. 2 can be represented as differences in practical parameter count. A ratio mask contains more parameters than a binary mask but fewer parameters than a non-negative mask, considering that any non-negative mask can be decomposed into the maximum value and a ratio mask. Moreover, a complex-valued mask contains more parameters than two non-negative masks because it can be represented as two real-valued masks corresponding to the real and imaginary parts, and a real value can be decomposed into a sign and a non-negative value.

Significant assumptions include the bias represented as the MSE in (7) and (62), is determined solely by the practical parameter count, implying that variation types (e.g., MinGEV, INV, and ISEV) do not affect the bias; and that the BF output z(t)minimizing the bias is uniquely determined independent of the BF variation used. The bias does not decrease further if the parameter count exceeds a particular number called the *saturation point*.

We illustrate the relationship between bias and practical parameter count in Fig. 9. The horizontal axis indicates relative counts. Variations using two ratio masks, such as the MaxGEV-, MinGEV-, INV-, and ISEV-NS BFs in Table 3, are represented as a point labeled *two ratio masks*, whereas those using a single ratio mask are labeled *single ratio mask*. The former has a larger parameter count than the latter. The ideal



Fig. 9 Relationship between bias (MSE) and practical parameter count for all BF variations and the ideal MMSE BF



Fig. 10 Relationship between bias (MSE) and practical parameter count for four scaling methods

MMSE BF includes the largest parameter count because it can be interpreted as a particular case using a complex-valued mask, as mentioned in 2.4. Given that all BF variations achieved the theoretical upper-bound performance obtained with the ideal MMSE BF, even variations using a single ratio mask exceed the saturation point.

An open question remains whether all variations exceed the saturation point for any dataset. Therefore, exploring peak extraction performance using various datasets is required.

# 6.2 Why can scaling using a non-negative mask behave as the IS?

Similar to the filter estimation, a scaling mask represented in (59) and (62) can also be interpreted as a model parameter set. We illustrate the relationship between bias and practical parameter count in Fig. 10. A non-negative mask contains more parameters than a ratio mask, as previously discussed. The IS method contains the largest number of parameters because it corresponds to using a complex-valued mask, as mentioned in 4.2. In contrast, the MDP includes no parameters because this corresponds to the case where all the mask values are fixed to 1.

The saturation point for scaling exists between the MDP and non-negative mask. The MDP underperforms the IS in Table 8, whereas the non-negative mask achieves the same performance as the IS. The practical parameter count of a ratio mask is close to, but slightly lower than, the saturation point because results using the ratio mask in Table 8 appear to degrade slightly compared to the IS.

Considering that a scaling mask will be estimated with a DNN in future work, a stronger mask constraint is desirable for more efficient DNN training, as mentioned in **4.3**. Therefore, it is crucial to find a proper mask type that can achieve the same performance as the IS while being more constrained than the non-negative mask.

# 6.3 Significance of all variations achieving the upper-bound performance

Comparing the results of Experiment 3 with the scores of existing TSE methods, such as mask-based BFs and ICA-based ones, is informative for designing a TSE system. Table 11 presents the SDR, PESQ, and STOI scores reported in the studies using the CHiME-4 (or CHiME-3) test sets. The eSTOI scores are omitted as they were only reported in [1] and [34]. For fair comparisons, the scores obtained with the batch (or offline) algorithms are chosen, although several studies also reported scores using online algorithms. Therefore, these scores may not be the best in each study. The nonlinear post-process (NLPP) indicates processes applied to the estimated target or BF output except for the scaling process represented as (3); the seventh and eighth rows employ the NLPP, whereas the remaining rows do not. Scores outperforming the ideal MMSE BF are underlined.

The first row indicates the scores obtained with the ideal MMSE BF. As shown in Table 10, all BF variations achieve the same scores if the optimal masks are obtained. These scores only represent the upper-bound performance of linear TSE methods, leaving room for nonlinear methods to outperform.

The second to fourth rows indicate the scores of mask-based BFs, max-SNR [1], MVDR [8], and MMSE BFs [16], respectively. As mentioned in 4.1, each method corresponds to one of the 12 variations shown in Table 3. Comparing these rows with

Method	Filter estimation	Scaling	NLPP	SDR [dB]	PESQ	STOI [%]
Ideal MMSE	INV-OS	IS	-	19.44	2.77	97.03
${} {$	MaxGEV-NS	-	-	2.92	2.46	87
Erdogan+16 [8] (MVDR)	ISEV-NS	-	-	14.36	-	-
Shimada+19 [16] (MMSE)	INV-OS	-	-	15.97	2.69	94
Cho+21 [34] (MLDR) Hiroe 21 [20] (SIBF)	ISEV-NS MinGEV-NO	$\begin{array}{c} \mbox{Adjusting SV}^1 \\ \mbox{MDP} \end{array}$	-	- 17.29	$2.70 \\ 2.72$	- 96.18
Hiroe 21 [20] (SIBF) Wang+20 [50] (MVDR)	MinGEV-NO ISEV-NS	$\begin{array}{c} \mathrm{MDP} \\ \mathrm{Adjusting} \ \mathrm{SV}^1 \end{array}$	DNN DNN	$\begin{array}{ c c c c c }\hline \underline{19.62}\\ \underline{22.4} \end{array}$	$\frac{3.00}{3.7}$	96.36 <u>98.6</u>

<sup>1</sup>Dividing SV by one of its elements to determine the SV and filter scales

Table 10, it can be inferred that the score differences among methods are not due to the variation adopted but rather the estimation of the optimal mask and scale.

The fifth and sixth rows show the scores of the ICA-based TSE methods, MLDR BF [34] and SIBF [20], respectively; the SIBF scores are the results of the sixth iterative casting mentioned in 3.1. These methods compute  $\hat{\Phi}_n$  from the target source model based on a different formulation than mask-based BFs, as mentioned in Section 3. However, given that these correspond to the ISEV-NS and MinGEV-NO BFs shown in Table 3, their upper-bound performance can be considered the same as the ideal MMSE BF if the weights for  $\hat{\Phi}_n$  (regarded as mask values) and scale are optimally estimated. This study allows treating both mask-based BFs and ICA-based TSE methods similarly.

Several studies reported scores outperforming the ideal MMSE BF despite using formulas included in the 12 variations [20, 50], as shown in the last two rows of Table 11. These results are attributed to the NLPP. In [20], scores were obtained by computing r(t)z'(t)/|z'(t)|, where r(t) and z'(t) denote the reference in the sixth iterative casting and SIBF output in the fifth casting, respectively. The NLPP of modifying the magnitude of the SIBF output with the reference-estimating DNN assisted in outperforming the upper-bound performance of the BFs. Meanwhile, in [50], a DNN for post-processing, different from the one for computing  $\hat{\Phi}_s$  and  $\hat{\Phi}_n$ , was trained to estimate the target from both the MVDR output z(t) and observation  $x_k(t)$ . We can estimate that the MVDR outputs underperformed the ideal MMSE BF, although the corresponding scores are not reported in [50]; thus, the DNN-based post-process largely contributes to outperforming the ideal MMSE BF.

#### 6.4 Discussion on the INV- and ISEV-NO BFs

The experimental results demonstrate that the INV- and ISEV-NO BFs achieved the theoretical upper-bound performance despite differing from conventional BFs. Here, we discuss the reason.

Considering that both  $\Phi_{\mathbf{x}} \boldsymbol{e}_k$  in (50) and SEV<sub>max</sub> ( $\Phi_{\mathbf{x}}$ ) in (52) differ from the accurate SV represented as (35), both BFs can be interpreted as the MVDR BF using an inaccurate SV in (36). However, this does not result in performance degradation unlike the MPDR BF mentioned in **2.5** because, 1) using  $\hat{\Phi}_n$  instead of  $\Phi_x$  prevents the target cancelation problem as mentioned in **2.5**, and 2) using mask-based scaling instead of the denominator in (36) properly estimates the scale regardless of SV accuracy.

This discussion suggests that a novel variation involving both the INV- and ISEV-NO BFs can be proposed. However, it is estimated that this variation can also achieve the upper-bound performance if the practical parameter count exceeds the saturation point illustrated in Fig. 9.

### 7 Conclusions

This study explored the peak extraction performance of mask-based BFs. To compare multiple BFs under the same conditions, we proposed a unified framework for mask-based BFs consisting of two processes: filter extraction and scaling. To encompass all

BF variations, we proposed a methodology that can enumerate all possible BFs by following the derivation steps for max-SNR BF and derived 12 variations, naming them systematically. We found that this process can also cover ICA-based TSE methods like SIBF and MLDR BF, despite their different formulations, because the variations include formulas used for SIBF and MLDR BF. For the scaling process, we proposed a mask-based scaling method that can be combined with any BF variation and applied to realistic scenarios. The optimal masks for both processes are obtained by minimizing the MSE between the target and BF output. We also examined the appropriate mask type for both processes, based on two perspectives: theoretical requirements in the formulation and constraints for efficient training of mask-estimating DNNs. Consequently, the framework allowed us to compare all possible BF variations under unified conditions.

Through a series of experiments using the CHiME-4 dataset, where optimal masks were obtained utterance by utterance, we verified that; 1) all 12 BF variations using ratio masks can commonly achieve theoretical upper-bound performance, 2) mask-based scaling using a non-negative mask can act as the IS, and 3) jointly optimizing both processes can also achieve the same performance.

In the discussion, we explained why the unified framework can achieve the upperbound performance by considering the relationship between practical parameter count and saturation point, based on the bias-variance tradeoff concept. For filter extraction, all the variations are considered to surpass the saturation point in terms of parameter count, similar to the ideal MMSE BF. For scaling, the saturation point is considered to lie between the method using a ratio mask and that using a nonnegative one. This concept can account for the upper-bound performance of any novel variation proposed. We also indicated that the experimental results contribute to designing a TSE system by comparing the results with conventional studies using the same dataset. Finally, we discussed why several variations, such as the INV-NO and ISEV-NO BFs, can estimate the target despite being rarely employed as BFs.

This study contributes to the following aspects:

- 1. Facilitating TSE system design by indicating that extraction performance is determined by not the BF used, but mask estimation, scaling, and nonlinear post-processing.
- 2. Estimating the upper-bound performance of the BF used by employing the concept of the practical parameter count and saturation point.
- 3. Improving extraction performance of any BFs combined with mask-based scaling.

These contributions also apply to ICA-based TSE methods because the unified framework includes formulas used in those methods.

Future work includes 1) examining the extraction performance of the unified framework when masks are estimated with DNNs in realistic scenarios, and 2) verifying that all BF variations can achieve the same peak performance by using other datasets.

The experimental system has been shared in https://github.com/hreshare/unified\_framework\_for\_mask-based\_bf/.

#### Abbreviations.

Abs: absolute function

AM: acoustic model ASR: automatic speech recognition BAN: blind analytical normalization BF: beamformer BN: batch normalization dB: decibel DNN: deep neural network eSTOI: extended short-time objective intelligibility measure GEV: generalized eigenvalue decomposition *ICA*: independent component analysis INV: matrix inversion *IS:* ideal scaling ISEV: matrix inversion and standard eigenvalue decomposition JT: joint training MaxGEV: maximum eigenvector in generalized eigenvalue decomposition max-ONR: maximum observation-to-noise ratio max-SNR: maximum signal-to-noise ratio max-SOR: maximum signal-to-observation ratio *MDP*: minimal distortion principle *MinGEV:* minimum eigenvector in generalized eigenvalue decomposition *min-NOR:* minimum noise-to-observation ratio min-NSR: minimum noise-to-signal ratio min-OSR: minimum observation-to-signal ratio MLDR: maximum likelihood distortionless response MMSE: minimum mean square error MPDR: minimum power distortionless response MSE: mean square error MVDR: minimum variance distortionless response MWF: multichannel Wiener filter NLPP: nonlinear post-process *NO:*  $\mathbf{\Phi}_{n}$  and  $\mathbf{\Phi}_{x}$ NPP: noise presence probability *NS*:  $\hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}_{n}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}_{s}$ *OS:*  $\Phi_{\rm x}$  and  $\hat{\Phi}_{\rm s}$ PESQ: perceptual evaluation of speech quality SDR: source-to-distortion ratio SEV: standard eigenvector decomposition SIBF: similarity-and-independence-aware BF SPP: speech presence probability STOI: short-time objective intelligibility measure SV: steering vector TF: time-frequency TSE: target sound extraction TV: time-frequency-varying variance

# Declarations

Availability of data and materials. This study used the CHiME-4 dataset. The availability of this dataset is described at https://www.chimechallenge.org/challenges/chime4/data.

Competing interests. The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI grant No.20H00475.

Authors' contributions. Conceptualization, A.H., K.I. and K.N.; methodology, A.H.; software, A.H.; validation, A.H.; formal analysis, A.H.; investigation, A.H.; writing-original draft preparation, A.H.; writing-review and editing, A.H. and K.N.; visualization, A.H.; supervision, K.I. and K.N.; project administration, A.H.; funding acquisition, K.I and K.N. All authors read and approved the published version of the manuscript.

Acknowledgements. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI grant No.20H00475.

**Code availability.** All source codes used in the experiments are available at https://github.com/hreshare/unified\_framework\_for\_mask-based\_bf/.

## Appendix A Relationship between iteration count and extraction performance

Before conducting Experiment 1, we verified the following aspects using the system illustrated in Fig. 5 and setups listed in the bottom row of Table 5:

1. How many iterations are sufficient for convergence?

2. Can the BN layer accelerate convergence?

The relationships between each iteration count (ranging from 50 to 500) and the SDR score [dB] are plotted in Fig. A1. In Part (a), the BN layer was omitted, whereas in Part (b), it was enabled. To illustrate the theoretical upper-bound performance, the score of the ideal MMSE BF (17.92 dB) is also plotted as a dashed line. Considering the equivalence mentioned in 4.1, the MaxGEV-NS, NO, and OS BFs were omitted. Additionally, the MinGEV-NO and OS BFs were excluded in Part (b) because they caused errors during the execution of the GEV.

Comparing Parts (a) and (b) suggests that the BN layer can accelerate convergence; the scores of all variations appear to be saturated in Part (b), whereas those of the ISEV-NO and OS BFs do not even after 500 iterations in Part (a). Therefore, we adopted 500 iterations for all variations and employed the BN layer except for the MinGEV-NO and OS BFs. We do not consider that the setups penalized these two BFs because Part (a) suggests that their scores are saturated at 500 iterations even without the BN layer. In Experiment 1, we also omitted the BN layer for the MaxGEV-NO and OS BFs, considering the aforementioned equivalence, as shown in Table 7.



Fig. A1 Relationship between SDR scores [dB] and iteration counts; the batch normalization (BN) was omitted in (a), whereas enabled in (b).

	1-	NS	-NO	-0S
	$m_{\rm n}(t)$	$m_{\rm s}(t)$	$m_{\rm n}(t)$	$m_{\rm s}(t)$
MinGEV				
INV				
ISEV				
Target s <sub>5</sub> (	(t) Interference	$n_{5}(t)$ Observation $x_{5}$	$_{5}(t)$ <b>BF</b> output $z(t)$	Scaling mask $m_{\rm p}(t)$

Fig. A2 Optimal masks for nine BF variations  $(m_s(t): \text{mask for the target}, m_n(t): \text{mask for the interferences})$ ; the target, interference, observation, BF output, and optimal scaling mask are also displayed.

## Appendix B Optimal masks for nine BF variations

Here, we present the optimal masks obtained in Experiment 3. Fig. A2 illustrates the optimal masks for the nine BF variations, along with the target  $s_5(t)$ , interferences (background noise)  $n_5(t)$ , observation  $x_5(t)$ , BF output z(t), and optimal scaling mask  $m_p(t)$ . The target is included in the development set and labeled  $M04\_050C0101$ . The interferences were recorded on a bus. The observation is a mixture of the target and interferences with g = 1 in Fig. 4. Given that all the variations generated practically identical BF outputs and optimal scaling masks, Fig. A2 shows those obtained with the MinGEV-NS as representatives.

The optimal masks for filter estimation are ratio masks, and the mask values 0 and 1 are plotted in black and white, respectively. As mentioned in **4.1**, each mask indicates the solution to a different problem. Therefore, the optimal mask appears different for each BF variation. Meanwhile, the optimal scaling mask is a non-negative mask, with higher mask values plotted in brighter colors. As mentioned in **4.2**, this mask is the solution to the problem represented in (59), independent of the BF variation employed. Consequently, the optimal scaling mask is practically identical for all BF variations.

### References

- Chen, S.J., Subramanian, A.S., Xu, H., Watanabe, S.: Building state-of-the-art distant speech recognition using the CHiME-4 challenge with a setup of speech enhancement baseline. Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, INTERSPEECH 2018-Septe, 1571–1575 (2018)
- [2] Zmolikova, K., Delcroix, M., Ochiai, T., Kinoshita, K., Černocký, J., Yu, D.: Neural target speech extraction: An overview. IEEE Signal Process. Mag. 40(3), 8–29 (2023)
- [3] Swietojanski, P., Ghoshal, A., Renals, S.: Convolutional neural networks for distant speech recognition. IEEE Signal Process. Lett. 21(9), 1120–1124 (2014)
- [4] Mizumachi, M., Origuchi, M.: Advanced delay-and-sum beamformer with deep neural network. 22nd International Congress on Acoustics (ICA) (2016)
- [5] Mizumachi, M.: Neural network-based broadband beamformer with less distortion. Proceedings of International Congress on Acoustics (ICA 2019), 2760 (2019)
- [6] Heymann, J., Drude, L., Chinaev, A., Haeb-Umbach, R.: BLSTM supported GEV beamformer front-end for the 3RD CHiME challenge. 2015 IEEE Workshop on Automatic Speech Recognition and Understanding, ASRU 2015 - Proceedings (June 2016), 444–451 (2016)
- [7] Heymann, J., Drude, L., Haeb-Umbach, R.: Neural network based spectral mask estimation for acoustic beamforming. In: 2016 IEEE International Conference on

Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), pp. 196–200 (2016)

- [8] Erdogan, H., Hershey, J., Watanabe, S., Mandel, M., Le Roux, J.: Improved MVDR beamforming using single-channel mask prediction networks. Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, INTERSPEECH 08-12-Sept, 1981–1985 (2016)
- [9] Drude, L., Heymann, J., Haeb-Umbach, R.: Unsupervised training of neural maskbased beamforming. In: Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, INTERSPEECH, vol. 2019-September, pp. 1253–1257. International Speech Communication Association, ??? (2019)
- [10] Souden, M., Benesty, J., Affes, S.: A study of the LCMV and MVDR noise reduction filters. IEEE Trans. Signal Process. 58(9), 4925–4935 (2010)
- [11] Stenzel, S., Lawin-Ore, T.C., Freudenberger, J., Doclo, S.: A multichannel wiener filter with partial equalization for distributed microphones. In: 2013 IEEE Workshop on Applications of Signal Processing to Audio and Acoustics, pp. 1–4. IEEE, ??? (2013)
- [12] Nugraha, A.A., Liutkus, A., Vincent, E.: Multichannel audio source separation with deep neural networks. IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio Speech and Language Processing 24(9), 1652–1664 (2016)
- [13] Pfeifenberger, L., Zöhrer, M., Pernkopf, F.: DNN-based speech mask estimation for eigenvector beamforming. In: 2017 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), pp. 66–70 (2017)
- [14] Boeddeker, C., Erdogan, H., Yoshioka, T., Haeb-Umbach, R.: Exploring practical aspects of neural Mask-Based beamforming for Far-Field speech recognition. In: 2018 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), pp. 6697–6701 (2018)
- [15] Wang, Z., Vincent, E., Serizel, R., Yan, Y.: Rank-1 constrained multichannel wiener filter for speech recognition in noisy environments. Comput. Speech Lang. 49, 37–51 (2018)
- [16] Shimada, K., Bando, Y., Mimura, M., Itoyama, K., Yoshii, K., Kawahara, T.: Unsupervised speech enhancement based on multichannel NMF-Informed beamforming for Noise-Robust automatic speech recognition. IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing 27(5), 960–971 (2019)
- [17] Heymann, J., Bacchiani, M., Sainath, T.N.: Performance of mask based statistical beamforming in a smart home scenario. In: 2018 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), pp. 6722–6726 (2018)
- [18] Hiroe, A., Itoyama, K., Nakadai, K.: Is the ideal ratio mask really the best?

— exploring the best extraction performance and optimal mask of mask-based beamformers. Asia-pacific Signal Inf Process Assoc Annu Summit Conf, 1843–1850 (2023)

- [19] Barker, J., Marxer, R., Vincent, E., Watanabe, S.: The third 'CHiME' speech separation and recognition challenge: Analysis and outcomes. Comput. Speech Lang. (2017)
- [20] Hiroe, A.: Similarity-and-Independence-Aware beamformer with iterative casting and boost start for target source extraction using reference. IEEE Open Journal of Signal Processing 3, 1–20 (2022)
- [21] Cho, B.J., Lee, J.M., Park, H.M.: A beamforming algorithm based on maximum likelihood of a complex gaussian distribution with time-varying variances for robust speech recognition. IEEE Signal Process. Lett. 26(9), 1398–1402 (2019)
- [22] Shin, U.-H., Park, H.-M.: Statistical beamformer exploiting non-stationarity and sparsity with spatially constrained ICA for robust speech recognition. IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing **PP**(99), 1–14
- [23] Warsitz, E., Haeb-Umbach, R.: Blind acoustic beamforming based on generalized eigenvalue decomposition. IEEE Trans. Audio Speech Lang. Processing 15(5), 1529–1539 (2007)
- [24] Boeddeker, C., Hanebrink, P., Drude, L., Heymann, J., Haeb-Umbach, R.: Optimizing neural-network supported acoustic beamforming by algorithmic differentiation. In: 2017 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), pp. 171–175 (2017)
- [25] Deng, S., Bao, C., Cheng, R.: GEV beamforming with BAN integrating LPS estimation and post-filtering. In: 2020 IEEE International Conference on Signal Processing, Communications and Computing (ICSPCC), pp. 1–5 (2020)
- [26] Malek, J., Koldovský, Z., Bohac, M.: Block-online multi-channel speech enhancement using deep neural network-supported relative transfer function estimates. IET Signal Proc. 14(3), 124–133 (2020)
- [27] Ehrenberg, L., Gannot, S., Leshem, A., Zehavi, E.: Sensitivity analysis of MVDR and MPDR beamformers. In: 2010 IEEE 26-th Convention of Electrical and Electronics Engineers in Israel, pp. 000416–000420. IEEE, ??? (2010)
- [28] Gannot, S., Vincent, E., Markovich-Golan, S., Ozerov, A.: A consolidated perspective on multimicrophone speech enhancement and source separation. IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing 25(4), 692–730 (2017)
- [29] Martín-Doñas, J.M., Jensen, J., Tan, Z.-H., Gomez, A.M., Peinado, A.M.: Online multichannel speech enhancement based on recursive EM and DNN-Based speech

presence estimation. IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing 28, 3080–3094 (2020)

- [30] Xu, Y., Weng, C., Hui, L., Liu, J., Yu, M., Su, D., Yu, D.: Joint training of complex ratio mask based beamformer and acoustic model for noise robust asr. In: ICASSP 2019 - 2019 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), pp. 6745–6749 (2019)
- [31] Nguyen, H.B., Van Hai, D., Bui, T.D., Chau, H.N., Nguyen, Q.C.: Multi-Channel speech enhancement using a minimum variance distortionless response beamformer based on graph convolutional network. International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications; West Yorkshire 13(10), 2010 (2022)
- [32] Hyvärinen, A., Karhunen, J., Oja, E.: Independent Component Analysis, (2001)
- [33] Hiroe, A.: Similarity-and-Independence-Aware beamformer: Method for target source extraction using magnitude spectrogram as reference. In: Meng, H., Xu, B., Zheng, T.F. (eds.) Interspeech 2020, 21st Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, Virtual Event, Shanghai, China, 25-29 October 2020, pp. 3311–3315. ISCA, ??? (2020)
- [34] Cho, B.J., Park, H.-M.: Convolutional Maximum-Likelihood distortionless response beamforming with steering vector estimation for robust speech recognition. IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing 29, 1352–1367 (2021)
- [35] Ramirez Lopez, A., Ono, N., Remes, U., Palomaki, K., Kurimo, M.: Designing multichannel source separation based on single-channel source separation. ICASSP, IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing - Proceedings 2015-Augus(2), 469–473 (2015)
- [36] Smaragdis, P.: Blind separation of convolved mixtures in the frequency domain. Neurocomputing (1998)
- [37] Matsuoka, K.: Principles for eliminating two kinds of indeterminacy in blind source separation. In: 2002 14th International Conference on Digital Signal Processing Proceedings. DSP 2002 (Cat. No.02TH8628), vol. 1, pp. 147–1501 (2002)
- [38] Šarić, Z., Subotić, M., Bilibajkić, R., Barjaktarović, M., Stojanović, J.: Supervised speech separation combined with adaptive beamforming. Comput. Speech Lang. 76, 101409 (2022)
- [39] Jagtap, A.D., Karniadakis, G.: How important are activation functions in regression and classification? a survey, performance comparison, and future directions. J Mach Learn Model Comput abs/2209.02681 (2022)

- [40] Zhang, X., Wang, Z.-Q., Wang, D.: A speech enhancement algorithm by iterating single- and multi-microphone processing and its application to robust ASR. In: 2017 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), pp. 276–280. IEEE, ??? (2017)
- [41] Mashrur, A., Luo, W., Zaidi, N.A., Robles-Kelly, A.: Robust neural regression via uncertainty learning. In: 2021 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN), pp. 1–6. IEEE, ??? (2021)
- [42] Vincent, E., Watanabe, S., Nugraha, A.A., Barker, J., Marxer, R.: An analysis of environment, microphone and data simulation mismatches in robust speech recognition. Comput. Speech Lang. 46, 535–557 (2017)
- [43] Vincent, E., Gribonval, R., Fevotte, C.: Performance measurement in blind audio source separation. IEEE Trans. Audio Speech Lang. Processing 14(4), 1462–1469 (2006)
- [44] Beerends, J.G., Schmidmer, C., Berger, J., Obermann, M., Ullmann, R., Pomy, J., Keyhl, M.: Perceptual objective listening quality assessment (POLQA), the third generation ITU-T standard for end-to-end speech quality measurement part i-temporal alignment. AES: Journal of the Audio Engineering Society 61(6), 366– 384 (2013)
- [45] Taal, C.H., Hendriks, R.C., Heusdens, R., Jensen, J.: An algorithm for intelligibility prediction of Time–Frequency weighted noisy speech. IEEE Trans. Audio Speech Lang. Processing 19(7), 2125–2136 (2011)
- [46] Jensen, J., Taal, C.H.: An algorithm for predicting the intelligibility of speech masked by modulated noise maskers. IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio Speech and Language Processing 24(11), 2009–2022 (2016)
- [47] Paszke, A., Gross, S., Massa, F., Lerer, A., Bradbury, J., Chanan, G., Killeen, T., Lin, Z., Gimelshein, N., Antiga, L., Desmaison, A., Kopf, A., Yang, E., DeVito, Z., Raison, M., Tejani, A., Chilamkurthy, S., Steiner, B., Fang, L., Bai, J., Chintala, S.: PyTorch: An imperative style, High-Performance deep learning library. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32, pp. 8024–8035. Curran Associates, Inc., ??? (2019)
- [48] Ioffe, S., Szegedy, C.: Batch normalization: Accelerating deep network training by reducing internal covariate shift. In: Bach, F., Blei, D. (eds.) Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, vol. 37, pp. 448–456. PMLR, Lille, France (2015)
- [49] Belkin, M., Hsu, D., Ma, S., Mandal, S.: Reconciling modern machine-learning practice and the classical bias-variance trade-off. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 116(32), 15849–15854 (2019)

[50] Wang, Z.-Q., Wang, P., Wang, D.: Complex spectral mapping for single- and Multi-Channel speech enhancement and robust ASR. IEEE/ACM Trans Audio Speech Lang Process 28, 1778–1787 (2020)