

PUSHING THE LIMIT OF SOUND EVENT DETECTION WITH MULTI-DILATED FREQUENCY DYNAMIC CONVOLUTION

Hyeonuk Nam, Yong-Hwa Park

Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, South Korea
{frednam, yhpark}@kaist.ac.kr

ABSTRACT

Frequency dynamic convolution (FDY conv) has been a milestone in the sound event detection (SED) field, but it involves a substantial increase in model size due to multiple basis kernels. In this work, we propose *partial frequency dynamic convolution (PFD conv)*, which concatenates static convolution output and dynamic FDY conv output in order to minimize model size increase while maintaining the performance. Additionally, we propose *multi-dilated frequency dynamic convolution (MDFD conv)*, which integrates multiple dilated frequency dynamic convolution (DFD conv) branches with different dilation size sets and a static branch within a single convolution module, achieving a 3.17% improvement in polyphonic sound detection score (PSDS) over FDY conv. Proposed methods with extensive ablation studies further enhance understanding and usability of FDY conv variants.

Index Terms— sound event detection, frequency dynamic convolution, partial frequency dynamic convolution, multi-dilated frequency dynamic convolution

1. INTRODUCTION

The advent of deep learning has spurred extensive research in sound event detection (SED) [1, 2]. Initially, SED development borrowed methods from other domains but has since evolved with techniques tailored specifically for SED [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9]. Among these, frequency dynamic convolution (FDY conv) represents a significant advancement in the field [5, 10]. By reducing the translational equivariance of 2D convolution in the frequency dimension and adapting convolution kernels to input content, FDY Conv has greatly enhanced SED performance and inspired follow-up studies [5, 7, 10, 11, 12].

FDY conv involves a substantial increase in model size due to multiple basis kernels [6, 13]. FDY Conv with four

basis kernel almost triples the number of parameters in convolutional recurrent neural network (CRNN). Thus lighter alternative is needed for more efficient SED. In this context, time-frame frequency-wise squeeze and excitation has been proposed [9], but it does not solve translational equivariance problem of 2D convolution on frequency dimension.

To minimize the parameter increase in FDY conv, we propose *partial frequency dynamic convolution (PFD conv)*. By concatenating conventional 2D convolution output and FDY conv output, PFD conv effectively reduces the model size while retaining the performance. Furthermore, by introducing multiple dynamic branches, we can employ multiple independent FDY convs in single convolution layer. To further enhance the performance, multiple dilated frequency dynamic convolution (DFD conv) modules with different dilation size sets are added to the static convolution branch [12]. Resultant *multi-dilated frequency dynamic convolution (MDFD conv)* outperforms FDY conv by 3.17% in terms of polyphonic sound detection score (PSDS). The main contributions of this paper are as follows:

1. We introduced a concept of concatenating static and dynamic conv branches for efficient or powerful SED.
2. Extensive ablation studies showed various proportions of static and dynamic branches with varying dilation sizes to balance model size and performance.
3. Proposed *partial frequency dynamic convolution (PFD conv)* reduces the model size by 51.9% while retaining the performance of FDY conv.
4. Proposed *multi-dilated frequency dynamic convolution (MDFD conv)* aggregates various DFD conv branches to outperform FDY conv by 3.17%.

The official implementation code is available on GitHub¹.

2. METHODS

2.1. Partial Frequency Dynamic Convolution

Partial frequency dynamic convolution (PFD conv) concatenates the FDY conv output and the conventional 2D convolution output. Since only a part of PFD conv output channels

This work was supported by the Institute of Civil Military Technology Cooperation funded by the Defense Acquisition Program Administration and Ministry of Trade, Industry and Energy of Korean government under grant No. UM22409RD4, and Korea Research Institute of Ships and Ocean engineering a grant from Endowment Project of “Development of Open Platform Technologies for Smart Maritime Safety and Industries” funded by Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries(PES4880).

¹<https://github.com/frednam93/MDFD-SED>




Fig. 1. An illustration of partial frequency dynamic convolution operation which consists of dynamic FDY conv branch and static conventional 2D convolution branch. x and y are input and output of PFD conv. N and M determine the proportion of output of which FDY conv is applied.




Fig. 2. An illustration of multi-dilated frequency dynamic convolution operation. It involves multiple dynamic DFD conv branches and single static branch.

are obtained from FDY conv, the parameter count is proportionally reduced. Translational equivariance of 2D convolution on frequency dimension could benefit SED considering that neighboring frequency bins should share similar time-frequency patterns. This should be also potential reason why using limited number of basis kernel for FDY conv is optimal for SED. Thus, proposed PFD conv can maintain or enhance SED performance while reducing the model size. Fig. 1 illustrate the procedure for PFD conv, where dynamic branch processes FDY conv while static branch processes conventional 2D convolution then the output is concatenated.

2.2. Multi-Dilated Frequency Dynamic Convolution

To further develop PFD conv, we could use more dynamic branches to independently process multiple FDY convs. In addition, we could adopt dilated frequency dynamic convolution (DFD conv) for dynamic branches as well [12]. Therefore, we propose Multi-dilated frequency dynamic convolution (MDFD conv). As illustrated in Fig. 2, we could apply multiple DFD conv dynamic branches with single 2D convolution static branch. While MDFD conv is not as light as PFD conv, it includes various dilation size sets using multiple DFD conv modules to further enhance SED performance.

3. EXPERIMENTAL SETUPS

3.1. Implementation Details

Domestic environment sound event detection (DESED) dataset is used to train, validate and test SED models in this work. DESED is composed of synthesized strongly labeled

Table 1. Performance of partial frequency dynamic convolution models with varying proportion of dynamic branch.

models	Params(M)	PSDS1
CRNN	4.428	0.410
PFD-CRNN (1/32)	4.794	0.436
PFD-CRNN (1/16)	4.996	0.434
PFD-CRNN (1/8)	5.401	0.442
PFD-CRNN (2/8)	6.209	0.439
PFD-CRNN (3/8)	7.018	0.443
PFD-CRNN (4/8)	7.827	0.439
PFD-CRNN (5/8)	8.635	0.436
PFD-CRNN (6/8)	9.444	0.441
PFD-CRNN (7/8)	10.253	0.443
FDY-CRNN	11.061	0.441

dataset, real weakly labeled dataset, real unlabeled dataset and real strongly labeled dataset [2]. No external dataset is used in this work except for Table 6. We extract mel spectrograms from audio data and input them into CRNN-based SED models. The CRNN models in this work consists of 7 convolution layers, where the first convolution layer uses conventional 2D convolution and the rest convolution layers use FDY conv or its variants for Table 1, 2 and 3. To additionally apply FDY conv on first convolution layer, we introduce pre-convolution before the first convolution on Table 4. When DFD conv modules are applied, the last convolution layer uses non-dilated FDY conv as in [12]. Data augmentation methods applied in this work includes frame shift [2], mixup [14], time masking [15] and FilterAugment [16]. We applied median filter with 7 frames (corresponding to 450ms) for all classes as post processing.

3.2. Evaluation Metrics

To evaluate SED performance, polyphonic sound detection score (PSDS) was used [17]. For DCASE challenge 2021 and 2022 task4 [2], two types of PSDS were used. Among them, PSDS2 is more specific to audio tagging than SED, thus we only used PSDS1 in this work [18, 19]. PSDS results listed in the tables are the best score from 12 separate training runs.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Partial Frequency Dynamic Convolution

The results of PFD conv using various proportion is shown in Table 1. From the table, PFD-CRNN (1/ N) denotes that 1/ N of output channel by FDY conv module and the rest of the channels are from static convolution. We experimented PFD conv with 1/32, 1/16 and $n/8$ where $n = 1, 2, \dots, 7$ as the number of channels on CNN module in CRNN is multiple of 32; 32, 64, 128, 256, 256, 256 from 1st to 7th convolution layers. Note that FDY-CRNN is equivalent to PFD-CRNN with proportion 8/8. The results show that with a proportion above 1/8, PFD-CRNN's PSDS is slightly worse or similar to that of FDY-CRNN, except for the model with

Table 2. Performance of multi-frequency dynamic convolutions models.

models	# DYbr	Params(M)	PSDS1
FDY-CRNN	1	11.061	0.441
PFD-CRNN (1/8)	1	5.401	0.442
MFD-CRNN (1/32)	4	5.896	0.430
MFD-CRNN (1/16)	2	5.566	0.439
MFD-CRNN (1/8)	2	6.374	0.439
MFD-CRNN (1/8)	3	7.348	0.444
MFD-CRNN (1/8)	4	8.322	0.440
MFD-CRNN (1/8)	5	9.296	0.449
MFD-CRNN (1/8)	6	10.270	0.452
MFD-CRNN (1/8)	7	11.243	0.445
MFD-CRNN (1/8)	8	12.217	0.447

a proportion 5/8. But PFD-CRNNs with proportion 1/16 and 1/32 perform worse than FDY-CRNN. The most efficient model is PFD-CRNN with proportion 1/8, which only introduce 22.0% of additional parameters to CRNN and reduces 51.9% of parameters from FDY-CRNN while retaining the performance by FDY-CRNN.

4.2. Multi-Frequency Dynamic Convolution

To test the effect of multiple FDY conv modules without dilation, we experimented with MDFD conv without dilation in this subsection. We call this module as multi-frequency dynamic convolution (MFD conv). The result is shown in Table 2, where #DYbr stands for the number of dynamic branches. Four 1/32 and two 1/16 FDY modules are tested to verify if 1/8 of dynamic output channels are beneficial, but the results show that 1/8-sized FDY module is minimum that does not harm the performance compared to FDY conv. Furthermore, we experimented on multiple 1/8-sized FDY modules for further performance enhancement. The results is that five and six branches improve SED performance, while still lighter than FDY conv model. This results demonstrates that multiple dynamic branches enhances SED performance, possibly by learning different dynamic pattern recognition by each branch. Also, we infer from the results that minimum required static branch channel proportion is $1/4 \sim 3/8$ since less proportion deteriorates the performance.

4.3. Multi-Dilated Frequency Dynamic Convolution

By introducing dilation to the MFD-CRNN model with five dynamic branches which showed good size to performance compromise, we experimented on dilating some of five dynamic branches in order to diversity the roles by different dynamic branches. The results are shown in Table 3, where dilation is notated to show only frequency-wise dilation and dilation size of 1 (meaning no dilation) is omitted. All dynamic branches have four basis kernels. For example, $(1) \times 3 + (2, 3) \times 2$ means 3 dynamic branches are not dilated and two dynamic branches have 2 non-dilated basis kernel, one basis kernel with dilation size of 2 and the last basis ker-

Table 3. Performance of multi-dilated frequency dynamic convolution models with varying dilation size sets. All partial dynamic branches have proportion of 1/8.

models	Dilation	PSDS1
FDY-CRNN	(1)	0.441
PFD-CRNN	(1)	0.442
MFD-CRNN	$(1) \times 5$	0.449
MDFD-CRNN	$(1) \times 4 + (2)$	0.449
MDFD-CRNN	$(1) \times 4 + (3)$	0.448
MDFD-CRNN	$(1) \times 4 + (2, 2)$	0.448
MDFD-CRNN	$(1) \times 4 + (2, 3)$	0.451
MDFD-CRNN	$(1) \times 4 + (3, 3)$	0.446
MDFD-CRNN	$(1) \times 4 + (2, 2, 3)$	0.446
MDFD-CRNN	$(1) \times 4 + (2, 3, 3)$	0.451
MDFD-CRNN	$(1) \times 3 + (2, 3) \times 2$	0.448
MDFD-CRNN	$(1) \times 3 + (2, 2, 3) \times 2$	0.449
MDFD-CRNN	$(1) \times 3 + (2, 3, 3) \times 2$	0.450
MDFD-CRNN	$(1) \times 3 + (2, 3) + (2, 3, 3)$	0.451
MDFD-CRNN	$(1) \times 2 + (2, 3) \times 3$	0.449
MDFD-CRNN	$(1) \times 2 + (2, 2, 3) \times 3$	0.452
MDFD-CRNN	$(1) \times 2 + (2, 3, 3) \times 3$	0.447
MDFD-CRNN	$(1) \times 2 + (2, 3) + (2, 2, 3) + (2, 3, 3)$	0.447

nel with dilation size 3. Application of dilation results in similar or slightly better performance as in [12]. While application of dilation adds new expanded and diversified dynamic branches, it removes the FDY branch without dilation so it might increase and decrease the performance at the same time. We interpret the results that as much as DFD conv branch benefits SED, FDY conv branch also contributes well.

4.4. Multi-Dilated Frequency Dynamic Convolution with Pre-convolution and Varying Channel sizes

We experimented the effect of additionally introduced dynamic branches with expanded channel sizes in Table 4. In addition, to further enhance the performance, pre-convolution module with output channel size of 16 is added in front of CNN module to add MDFD conv to 1st convolution layer. Without pre-convolution, the input channel size of 1st convolution layer is one, thus it is meaningless to extract K frequency-adaptive attention weights from single channel. Addition of three dilated dynamic branches with varying dilation sizes results in PSDS1 of 0.455, which outperforms FDY-CRNN by 3.17%. With post-processing, it could be further enhanced. However, adding six dilated dynamic branches results in worse performance, showing that too many dynamic branches rather harms the performance. While it involves far more parameters, the results show that several dynamic branches without dilation helps the performance and adding right amount of dilated dynamic branches enhances the performance.

Table 4. Performance of multi-dilated frequency dynamic convolution models with pre-convolution and varying channel sizes.

models	# Channels	Dilation	Params(M)	PSDS1
FDY-CRNN	8/8 (32,64,128,256)	(1)	11.061	0.441
DFD-CRNN	8/8 (32,64,128,256)	(2,3)	11.061	0.448
PFD-CRNN	8/8 (32,64,128,256)	(1)	5.401	0.442
MFD-CRNN	8/8 (32,64,128,256)	(1)×5	9.296	0.449
MDFD-CRNN	8/8 (32,64,128,256)	(1)×2+(2,3)+(2,2,3)+(2,3,3)	9.296	0.447
FDY-CRNN	11/8 (44,88,176,352)	(1)	19.317	0.434
MDFD-CRNN	11/8 (44,88,176,352)	(1)×8	18.157	0.449
MDFD-CRNN	11/8 (44,88,176,352)	(1)×3+(2)+(3)+(2,3)+(2,2,3)+(2,3,3)	18.157	0.454
MDFD-CRNN	11/8 (44,88,176,352)	(1)×5+(2,3)+(2,2,3)+(2,3,3)	18.157	0.455
MDFD-CRNN	11/8 (44,88,176,352)	(1)×6+(2,3)+(2,2,3)+(2,3,3)	19.582	0.450
MDFD-CRNN	13/8 (52,104,208,416)	(1)×5+(2,2)+(3,3)+(2,3)+(2,2,3)+(2,3,3)	26.191	0.446
MDFD-CRNN	14/8 (56,112,224,448)	(1)×5+(2,2)+(3,3)+(2,2,3,3)+(2,3)+(2,2,3)+(2,3,3)	30.894	0.433

Table 5. Performance comparison of MDFD-CRNN with state-of-the-art models without external dataset. Pp, mf cw and ssl stand for post processing, median filter, class-wise and semi-supervised learning method.

models	PP	SSL	PSDS1	tPSDS1
FDY-CRNN [6]	cw-mf	MT	0.451	-
DFD-CRNN [12]	cw-mf	MT	0.455	0.465
MFD-CRNN [7]	cw-mf	MT	0.461	-
MFD-CRNN [7]	cw-mf	CMT	0.470	-
MDFD-CRNN	mf	MT	0.455	0.468
MDFD-CRNN	cw-mf	MT	0.461	0.474
MDFD-CRNN	cSEBBs	MT	-	0.485

4.5. Comparison with State-of-the-art Models

We compared best MFD-CRNN model with state-of-the-art model without external dataset on Table 5. With class-wise median filter, it achieves same score with MFD-CRNN [7]. Application of cSEBBs on MDFD-CRNN achieves true PSDS1 of 0.485, which is the state-of-the-art score on DESED without external dataset [19, 22].

To compare the performance of MDFD conv with state-of-the-art models with pre-trained audio models, we implemented MDFD conv on DCASE 2024 challenge Task 4 setting as shown in Table 6 [20, 23, 24, 25]. Table 6 includes other sota models with pre-trained models but without ensembling and self-training with AudioSet, since those methods are mainly for maximizing the performance rather than for comparing effect of methods. Detailed settings of ABC model are referred to [26]. Change-detection-based sound event bounding boxes (cSEBBs) is used as post-processing [19]. Evaluation metric used is true PSDS1 [22]. Fine-tuning of ATST-frame further enhanced the performance, while it does not show significant performance gain with cSEBBs. This could be due to use of class-wise median filter. The resultant model outperforms DCASE 2023 and 2024 challenge winners without ensemble and self training [5, 21]. Also, ABC w/ MDFD-CRNN best model performs close to ATST-SED model with fine-tuning ATST-frame [20].

Table 6. Performance comparison of PFD, MDFD-CRNN with state-of-the-art models with pretrained audio models without AudioSet or ensemble. Pp, mf cw, and ft stand for post processing, median filter, class-wise and fine-tuning. ABC stands for model with ATST-frame, BEATs and CRNN.

models	PP	tPSDS1
FDY-LKA-CRNN + BEATs [5]	cw mf	0.525
CRNN + ATSTframe [20]	cw mf	0.492
CRNN + ATSTframe + ft [20]	cw mf	0.583
CRNN + BEATs + ft [21]	cw mf	0.539
ABC	mf	0.507
ABC w/ PFD-CRNN	mf	0.517
ABC w/ MDFD-CRNN.	mf	0.524
ABC w/ MDFD-CRNN + ft	cw mf	0.550
ABC	cSEBBs	0.546
ABC w/ PFD-CRNN	cSEBBs	0.558
ABC w/ MDFD-CRNN	cSEBBs	0.577
ABC w/ MDFD-CRNN + ft	cSEBBs	0.554

5. CONCLUSION

Proposed partial frequency dynamic convolution concatenates outputs of FDY conv module and convolution module to reduce the model size. Consequently, PFD-CRNN reduced the number of parameters by 51.9% compared to FDY-CRNN while retaining the performance. Proposed multi-frequency dynamic convolution module introduces more dynamic branches to further enhance the performance. Best MDFD-CRNN model outperforms FDY-CRNN by 3.17%. Extensive ablation studies showed that minimum proportion of dynamic branches is 1/8, minimum proportion of static branch is 1/4 ~ 3/8, and non-dilated FDY conv branches also beneficial thus additional DFD conv branches with expanded channels further enhanced the performance. With cSEBBs, MDFD-CRNN achieves true PSDS1 of 0.485, which is state-of-the-art in DESED without external dataset. MDFD-CRNN with pre-trained models shows comparable performances to previous state-of-the-art model.

6. REFERENCES

- [1] T. Virtanen, M. D. Plumbley, and D. Ellis, *Computational Analysis of Sound Scenes and Events*, pp. 3–11, 71–77, Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 1st edition, 2017.
- [2] N. Turpault, R. Serizel, A. P. Shah, and J. Salamon, “Sound event detection in domestic environments with weakly labeled data and soundscape synthesis,” in *DCASE Workshop*, 2019.
- [3] K. Miyazaki, T. Komatsu, T. Hayashi, S. Watanabe, T. Toda, and K. Takeda, “Convolution-augmented transformer for semi-supervised sound event detection,” Tech. Rep., DCASE Challenge, 2020.
- [4] X. Zheng, H. Chen, and Y. Song, “Zheng ustc team’s submission for dcase2021 task4 – semi-supervised sound event detection,” Tech. Rep., DCASE Challenge, 2021.
- [5] J. W. Kim, S. W. Son, Y. Song, H. K. Kim, I. H. Song, and J. E. Lim, “Semi-supervised learning-based sound event detection using frequency dynamic convolution with large kernel attention for DCASE challenge 2023 task 4,” Tech. Rep., DCASE Challenge, 2023.
- [6] H. Nam, S.-H. Kim, B.-Y. Ko, and Y.-H. Park, “Frequency Dynamic Convolution: Frequency-Adaptive Pattern Recognition for Sound Event Detection,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, 2022.
- [7] S. Xiao, X. Zhang, and P. Zhang, “Multi-dimensional frequency dynamic convolution with confident mean teacher for sound event detection,” in *ICASSP*, 2023.
- [8] K. Li, Y. Song, L.-R. Dai, I. McLoughlin, X. Fang, and L. Liu, “ast-sed: an effective sound event detection method based on audio spectrogram transformer,” in *ICASSP*, 2023.
- [9] H. Nam, S.-H. Kim, D. Min, and Y.-H. Park, “Frequency & channel attention for computationally efficient sound event detection,” in *DCASE Workshop*, 2023.
- [10] S. Xiao, J. Shen, A. Hu, X. Zhang, P. Zhang, and Y. Yan, “Sound event detection with weak prediction for dcase 2023 challenge task4a,” Tech. Rep., DCASE Challenge, 2023.
- [11] D. Min, H. Nam, and Y.-H. Park, “Auditory neural response inspired sound event detection based on spectrotemporal receptive field,” in *DCASE Workshop*, 2023.
- [12] H. Nam, S.-H. Kim, D. Min, J. Lee, and Y.-H. Park, “Diversifying and expanding frequency-adaptive convolution kernels for sound event detection,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.05341*, 2024.
- [13] Y. Chen, X. Dai, M. Liu, D. Chen, L. Yuan, and Z. Liu, “Dynamic convolution: Attention over convolution kernels,” in *CVPR*, 2020.
- [14] H. Zhang, M. Cisse, Y. N. Dauphin, and D. Lopez-Paz, “mixup: Beyond empirical risk minimization,” in *ICLR*, 2018.
- [15] D. S. Park, W. Chan, Y. Zhang, C.-C. Chiu, B. Zoph, E. D. Cubuk, and Q. V. Le, “SpecAugment: A Simple Data Augmentation Method for Automatic Speech Recognition,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, 2019.
- [16] H. Nam, S.-H. Kim, and Y.-H. Park, “Filteraugument: An acoustic environmental data augmentation method,” in *ICASSP*, 2022.
- [17] Ç. Bilen, G. Ferroni, F. Tuveri, J. Azcarreta, and S. Krstulović, “A framework for the robust evaluation of sound event detection,” in *ICASSP*, 2020, pp. 61–65.
- [18] H. Nam, B.-Y. Ko, G.-T. Lee, S.-H. Kim, W.-H. Jung, S.-M. Choi, and Y.-H. Park, “Heavily augmented sound event detection utilizing weak predictions,” Tech. Rep., DCASE Challenge, 2021.
- [19] J. Ebberts, F. G. Germain, G. Wichern, and J. L. Roux, “Sound event bounding boxes,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.04212*, 2024.
- [20] N. Shao, X. Li, and X. Li, “Fine-tune the pretrained atst model for sound event detection,” in *ICASSP*, 2024.
- [21] F. Schmid, P. Primus, T. Morocutti, J. Greif, and G. Widmer, “Improving audio spectrogram transformers for sound event detection through multi-stage training,” Tech. Rep., DCASE2024 Challenge, 2024.
- [22] J. Ebberts, R. Haeb-Umbach, and Romain Serizel, “Threshold independent evaluation of sound event detection scores,” in *ICASSP*, 2022.
- [23] J. F. Gemmeke, D. P. W. Ellis, D. Freedman, A. Jansen, W. Lawrence, R. C. Moore, M. Plakal, and M. Ritter, “Audio set: An ontology and human-labeled dataset for audio events,” in *ICASSP*, 2017.
- [24] S. Chen, Y. Wu, C. Wang, S. Liu, D. Tompkins, Z. Chen, W. Che, X. Yu, and F. Wei, “Beats: Audio pre-training with acoustic tokenizers,” in *ICML*, 2023.
- [25] X. LI and X. Li, “Atst: Audio representation learning with teacher-student transformer,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, 2022.
- [26] H. Nam, D. Min, I. Choi, S.-D. Choi, and Y.-H. Park, “Self training and ensembling frequency dependent networks with coarse prediction pooling and sound event bounding boxes,” Tech. Rep., DCASE Challenge, 2024.