

# On Feature Importance and Interpretability of Speaker Representations

Frederik Rautenberg<sup>1</sup>, Michael Kuhlmann<sup>1</sup>, Jana Wiechmann<sup>2</sup>, Fritz Seebauer<sup>2</sup>,  
Petra Wagner<sup>2</sup>, Reinhold Haeb-Umbach<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Communications Engineering, Paderborn University Email: {rautenberg, kuhlmann, haeb}@nt.upb.de

<sup>2</sup>Phonetics Work Group, Bielefeld University Email: {jana.wiechmann, fritz.seebauer, petra.wagner}@uni-bielefeld.de

## Abstract

Unsupervised speech disentanglement aims at separating fast varying from slowly varying components of a speech signal. In this contribution, we take a closer look at the embedding vector representing the slowly varying signal components, commonly named the speaker embedding vector. We ask, which properties of a speaker’s voice are captured and investigate to which extent do individual embedding vector components sign responsible for them, using the concept of Shapley values. Our findings show that certain speaker-specific acoustic-phonetic properties can be fairly well predicted from the speaker embedding, while the investigated more abstract voice quality features cannot.

## 1 Introduction

A core concept of modern deep learning methods is to compute a vector representation of input data by means of a neural network. This concept is used for all kinds of data, be it images, text, audio or any other data. Even different modalities are mapped to a common embedding vector space, which then allows for interactions among them, such that one modality can learn from the information present in the other. In this contribution, we look at embedding vectors that are meant to represent a speaker’s voice properties. Those are used in various applications, such as speaker verification, automatic speech recognition (ASR), diarization, or voice conversion.

While most of those, such as the well-known d-vectors [1] or x-vectors [2], are learnt discriminatively using a speaker classification objective, there are also approaches that compute embedding vectors in a completely unsupervised fashion [3–6]. They disentangle a speech signal into two representations with the goal that one represents the speaker and the other the content. This can be achieved by a carefully designed bottleneck [3], through appropriate normalization [4], or by mapping short-term, i.e., fast variations of the signal, and temporally more stable signal components into different representations [5, 6]. The latter is done with the underlying hypothesis, that fast variations of the speech signal are caused by the linguistic content of what is spoken, while components that change at a much slower rate, are caused by speaker specific voice properties. Indeed, those approaches have been successfully used for voice conversion. Here the embedding vector, which represents the temporally stable parts of the signal, is replaced by that computed from a target speaker, before the speech signal is reconstructed [7].

The purpose of this paper is to put this last hypothesis under verification. Calling the embedding vector that captures the temporally stable signal parts in the following “speaker embedding vector”, we want to know what is actually represented in this vector. We are aware that the statistics of environmental noise are typically also temporally more stable than the speech signal, and thus will

be cast to the speaker embedding vector, but this is not the focus of our work. We rather want to know, which voice properties are stored in the representation, and even which components of the vector capture which property of a speaker’s voice. We will consider both acoustic-phonetic features, such as average pitch, as well as voice quality categories, such as nasality or hoarseness.

We used the following methodology: we train a machine learning model to predict the voice property under investigation from the speaker embedding vector. The accuracy of the predictor is a measure of how well this particular speaker property is represented in the embedding. We then determine which component of the input speaker embedding vector takes how much responsibility for the prediction result and thus carries information about that property. This is done by using the concept of SHapley Additive exPlanations (SHAP) [8, 9], a method from cooperative game theory. Feature importance as measured by Shapley values is a common tool in machine learning [10], but not yet so common in speech processing. In [11] it was used to compute the attribution of input features to an estimated mask for speech enhancement, while in [12] Shapley values were employed to determine which features at the input are most influential for the ASR output.

While Canonical Correlation Analysis (CCA), that was used in [13] to calculate feature importance, is restricted to linear models, Shapley values can be computed for any machine learning model. In our study, we employ more complex machine learning models to perform linear and non-linear classification or regression tasks on the speaker embedding vector. The investigations show that statistical averages of acoustic-phonetic features are represented fairly well in the speaker embedding vector, while the investigated voice quality factors nasality and hoarseness are not well represented, although these properties are considered to be temporally stable. This is an important finding, as it shows that the current speaker embedding vector extraction system is not well prepared for voice quality conversion. Using phonetic insights to identify the acoustic correlates of such voice quality categories can give directions how the estimation of the speaker vector should be modified to better capture these characteristics.

The paper is organized as follows: We first give a brief overview of the concept of Shapley values. Section 3 outlines our experimental setup, Section 4 presents the results for predicting acoustic-phonetic and voice quality features, and Section 5 provides our conclusions.

## 2 Shapley Feature Importance

Assume we are given a fixed-dimensional speaker embedding vector. Our goal is to find out in which components of the embedding vector a certain acoustic or perceptual property of the signal is encoded. To this end, we are going to train a machine learning model, a classifier or regressor, to predict that property from the speaker embedding vec-

tor at its input and then estimate the importance of each component of the input feature vector for that prediction. We compute the feature importance using Shapley values, a concept from cooperative game theory. Here, the machine learning model is the game and the components of the speaker embedding vector at its input are the players in the game. The prediction of the model is the payout of the game. In order to compute a fair distribution of the payout among the players, the Shapley value computes the average attribution of a player to the outcome. In our problem, a feature’s Shapley value is a measure of its importance for the prediction for a specific input. By aggregating over all predictions, we obtain a feature vector component’s average contribution to the model predictions.

Next, we briefly summarize the concept of Shapley values, and then describe an approximate computation, called SHAP. We refer the reader to [9] for more details. We also show how SHAP simplifies in case of a linear model.

## 2.1 Shapley Values

The key idea of computing a feature importance with Shapley values is to compare the model output with the feature in question being present at its input and with it being absent. However, because features can interact with each other, we need to consider every possible subset of features, called coalition. To be specific, let  $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, \dots, x_I\}$  be a set of these features, whose elements also make up the feature vector  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_I)^\top$ , where both can be the input of the predictor.<sup>1</sup> We now have a machine learning model  $f(\cdot)$ , whose output  $\hat{y} = f(\mathcal{X})$  is the prediction for the label  $y$  and let  $x_i$  be one of the features, for which we want to compute the importance to that prediction. The contribution of a feature  $x_i$  to the coalition  $\mathcal{S}$  can be calculated with

$$m_i(\mathcal{S}, x_i) = f(\mathcal{S} \cup \{x_i\}) - f(\mathcal{S}), \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{X} \setminus \{x_i\}$  is a subset without  $x_i$  and the subset  $\mathcal{S} \cup \{x_i\}$  that includes  $x_i$ . It is worthwhile to note that a model output with a feature absent can be approximated by replacing the feature by a random value, since, on average, random inputs should not be able to contribute to the prediction. This idea can be verified as follows: Noting that sampling is a Monte Carlo approximation to compute an expectation and assuming that the prediction of the machine learning model is given by  $f(\mathcal{S} \cup \{x_i\}) = \mathbb{E}_y[y|\mathcal{S} \cup \{x_i\}]$ , which is the optimal prediction in the Mean Squared Error (MSE) sense. Averaging over  $x_i$  gives

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_i} [\mathbb{E}_y [y|\mathcal{S} \cup \{x_i\}]] = \mathbb{E}_y [y|\mathcal{S}] = f(\mathcal{S}), \quad (2)$$

which is the model output with the feature  $x_i$  being absent. To obtain the marginal contribution of the feature  $x_i$ , we compute a weighted average over all subsets  $\mathcal{S}$ , which results in the Shapley value of that feature

$$\phi_i(f, \mathcal{X}) = \sum_{\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{X} \setminus \{x_i\}} \frac{|\mathcal{S}|! \cdot (|\mathcal{X}| - |\mathcal{S}| - 1)!}{|\mathcal{X}|!} \cdot m_i(\mathcal{S}, x_i), \quad (3)$$

where  $|\cdot|$  defines the cardinality of the set. The weighting is chosen such that subsets with only few and subsets with almost all features have a high weight, because they are particularly informative about the feature importance

<sup>1</sup>We, here, at times use set notation,  $\mathcal{X}$ , and at times vector notation,  $\mathbf{x}$ , whatever is deemed more appropriate.

[9]. Eq. (3) is a local explanatory model, i.e., it explains the contribution of feature  $x_i$  to the outcome for a particular feature vector  $\mathbf{x}$ . To obtain a global explanation, i.e., the Shapley values that explain the contribution of the features to predictions from multiple observations, the Shapley values from each feature vector  $\mathbf{x}_n$  for all observations  $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N)$  have to be calculated and then averaged over all obtained values. Computing the Shapley values is computationally expensive, because the number of subsets grows exponentially with the number of features  $|\mathcal{X}|$ . However, methods that significantly reduce the complexity have been developed that approximate Eq. (3), one of them is briefly described next.

## 2.2 SHapley Additive exPlanations

Building upon the insight that an explanation is a model by itself, however a simpler one than the original model to be explained, SHAP [9] uses an additive explanation model  $g(\cdot)$  that locally approximates  $f(\cdot)$ :

$$g(\mathbf{z}') = \phi_0 + \sum_{i=1}^I \phi_i \cdot z'_i, \quad (4)$$

where the original input feature  $x_i$  is replaced by the simplified input  $z_i \in \{0, 1\}$ , where  $z_i = 1$  corresponds to the feature being present and  $z_i = 0$  to the feature being absent. Further,  $\phi_0$ , is the approximate model output if no feature is at its input, which is given by  $\phi_0 = \mathbb{E}_y[y]$ . In [9] it is shown that while several explanation models fall into this class of additive explanation models, only if the  $\phi_i$  are the Shapley values, then certain desirable properties of explanation models are met. In the following we will thus use the explanation model of Eq. (4), with  $\phi_i$  being the Shapley value for feature  $x_i$ .

## 2.3 SHAP for Linear Models

The linear minimum mean squared error estimator  $\hat{y}$  of variable  $y$ , given an input feature vector  $\mathbf{x}$ , is given by

$$\hat{y} = f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{E}[y] + \Sigma_{\mathbf{x}y}^\top \Sigma_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}}^{-1} (\mathbf{x} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}]), \quad (5)$$


where  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}y} = \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{x} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}])(y - \mathbb{E}[y])]$  is the cross-covariance vector with elements  $\sigma_{x_i y}$ , and  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}} = \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{x} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}])(\mathbf{x} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}])^\top]$  is the autocovariance matrix with elements  $\sigma_{x_i x_j}^2$ . If the components of  $\mathbf{x}$  are independent, then  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}}$  is a diagonal matrix with elements  $\sigma_{x_i x_i}^2$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, I$  on the main diagonal. Thus, Eq. (1), the difference in the model’s output with and without feature  $x_i$ , is given by

$$m_i(s_i) = \frac{\sigma_{x_i y}}{\sigma_{x_i x_i}^2}, \quad (6)$$

which is independent of the chosen coalition  $\mathcal{S}$ . Thus the weighting of different coalitions as in Eq. (3) is unnecessary, and  $m_i(s_i)$  is equal to the Shapley value  $\phi_i$ . We further note, that the linear model is identical to the CCA that has been used in [13] to assess the feature importance for predicting a certain acoustic signal property  $y$ .

## 3 Experimental Setup

The goal of this investigation is to better understand which information is represented in a speaker embedding vector. Here, we analyze the speaker embedding that is computed with the Factorized Variational Autoencoder (FVAE)



**Figure 1:** Architecture of the FVAE

that has been introduced in [6] and later used in [14] for voice conversion. In the following, we first briefly describe the FVAE, then describe the machine learning models for predicting acoustic-phonetic properties and the models for predicting voice quality categories from the speaker embeddings obtained from the FVAE. We then measure the prediction quality and estimate the Shapley values to shed light on which information is stored where in the speaker embeddings.

### 3.1 Factorized Variational Autoencoder

For our experiments we used the FVAE, see Fig. 1, that disentangles content related from speaker related variations in the speech signal using two encoders, a content encoder and a speaker encoder. The input of the FVAE is the log-mel feature sequence  $\mathbf{X}_{\text{mel}} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_T)$  of length  $T$  frames, and the decoder output is the reconstructed sequence  $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{\text{mel}}$  of the same length. Disentanglement is based on the hypothesis that content related variations of the speech signal change at a much faster rate than speaker related variations. Thus, the speaker embedding vector  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}$  is obtained by Global Average Pooling (GAP) of the speaker encoder outputs  $\mathbf{s}_t$ ,  $t = 1, \dots, T$  over the time dimension. On the contrary, the content encoder emits content representations  $\mathbf{C} = (\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_T)$  at frame rate. Disentanglement is actively encouraged by adding a Contrastive Predictive Coding (CPC) loss on the speaker representation and an adversarial CPC loss on the content representation to the reconstruction training objective. The former encourages similarity of  $\mathbf{s}_t$  and  $\mathbf{s}_{t+\tau}$ , where  $\tau$  denotes the time lag (typically in the order of a second). To further obfuscate speaker information for the content encoder, Vocal Tract Length Perturbation (VTLP) and instance normalization [4] are applied to the input of the content encoder.

The FVAE model is trained on the English data set Librispeech [15] and the decoder is further fine-tuned on the German data set LibriVoxDeEn [16] because it is used on a German data set as is described in the following. Disentanglement is achieved by the FVAE in a completely unsupervised fashion. Additionally, we employed a d-vector extractor for comparison purposes. It is a ResNet34 model that computes 256-dimensional speaker embeddings  $\mathbf{x}$  from 80-dimensional log-mel spectrograms [17]. It is trained in a supervised manner using a speaker classification loss on the VoxCeleb speech corpus [18].

### 3.2 Prediction Models for Acoustic Properties

The investigations on feature importance reported here, have been carried out on the Nautilus Speaker Characterization (NSC) corpus [19]. This is a German data set consisting of  $\approx 8$ h scripted and  $\approx 15$ h of semi-spontaneous dialogues, with a total of 300 speakers. Of those, 70% of the speakers were used for training the prediction mod-

els, and the remaining 30% for testing the models. We trained several prediction models on the speaker embeddings  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}$ . In a first set of experiments, we are interested in determining if speaker-specific acoustic-phonetic information is captured by  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}$ . For this purpose, we utilized the extended Geneva Minimalistic Acoustic Parameter Set (eGeMAPS), a set of 25 acoustic Low-Level Descriptors (LLDs) from which 88 functionals, including utterance-wise statistics such as mean and variance, are computed using openSMILE [20, 21]. From these, we have chosen the mean of the fundamental frequency  $y_p$ , known to be speaker dependent, and the Hammarberg index  $y_h$ , which is the ratio of the maximum power below 2000Hz to the maximum power in the range (2000Hz – 5000Hz) and it was used for emotion recognition [22]. Further, we included the Smoothed Cepstral Peak Prominence (CPPS)  $y_{\text{CPPS}}$  [23, 24] as additional speaker-dependent feature. We also selected an acoustic feature that is considered to be more content than speaker dependent: the mean length of voiced segments  $y_v$ .

For each of these continuous-valued acoustic-phonetic signal properties, we trained various regression models to predict them from the extracted embeddings: Linear Regression (LR), Support Vector Regressor (SVR), a Multi-layer Perceptron (MLP) with two hidden layers and two Voting Regressors (VRs). VR-1 consists of an SVR and an LR and VR-2 of a SVR and a MLP.

### 3.3 Prediction Models for Voice Quality

For the experiments on voice quality prediction, 300 speaker samples (174 female and 126 male speakers) of the semi-spontaneous dialogues of the NSC data set, each about 30 seconds long, had been labeled by an expert phonetician with regards to presence or absence of certain voice quality categories. In this study, we concentrate on two of them, hoarseness (81 hoarse speakers), and nasality (59 nasal speakers). Although, only the semi-spontaneous dialogues were manually labeled, we used the same labels for the scripted dialogues, because they were spoken in the same session by the same speakers. This was considered justified because hoarseness and nasality are temporally persistent and thus carry over to the scripted dialogues if spoken by the same speaker. For each of the two voice quality categories we trained the following classifiers: Linear Discriminant Analysis (LDA), Support Vector Classifier (SVC) and a Random Forest (RF).

## 4 Results

### 4.1 Acoustic Feature Prediction


Table 1 shows the results for the prediction of the acoustic-phonetic signal properties from the speaker embedding vectors  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}$  of the FVAE and  $\mathbf{d}$  of the d-vector extractor. Results are given in terms of coefficient of determination between the values  $y$  computed by openSMILE from the input speech  $\mathbf{X}$  and their estimates  $\hat{y}$  obtained from the predictor:

$$R^2(y, \hat{y}) = 1 - \frac{\mathbb{E}[(y - \hat{y})^2]}{\mathbb{E}[(y - \mathbb{E}[y])^2]}, \quad (7)$$

whose optimal value is equal to 1, which results if  $\hat{y}$  completely matches  $y$ . If the result is equal to 0, then the prediction is no better than the mean value of  $y$ . It can

Model	$R^2(y, \hat{y})$							
	$y_p$		$y_h$		$y_{CPPS}$		$y_v$	
	$\bar{s}$	$\mathbf{d}$	$\bar{s}$	$\mathbf{d}$	$\bar{s}$	$\mathbf{d}$	$\bar{s}$	$\mathbf{d}$
LR	.95	.93	.83	.54	.74	.69	.36	.46
SVR	.96	.93	.79	.51	.66	.67	.32	.46
MLP	.96	.95	.83	.48	.73	.64	.36	.43
VR-1	.97	.95	.85	.57	.75	.72	.42	.51
VR-2	.97	.95	.84	.54	.74	.70	.42	.51

**Table 1:** Performance of various regression models trained on speaker embedding  $\bar{s}$  or d-vector  $\mathbf{d}$  to predict certain acoustic-phonetic signal properties on the NSC corpus.



**Figure 2:** Normalized absolute values of the estimated Shapley values to explain the model output of the VR-2 for pitch and VR-2 for Hammarberg index.

be observed, that the performance of the different regression models is quite comparable. Looking at the predictions from the d-vectors, it is obvious, that the features  $y_p$  and  $y_{CPPS}$ , which are considered speaker-dependent, can be much better predicted than  $y_v$ , which was considered speaker-independent. Interestingly, the prediction results from  $\bar{s}$  for  $y_p$ ,  $y_{CPPS}$  and  $y_v$  are quite similar to those from  $\mathbf{d}$ . This is an indication that the assumption underlying the computation of  $\bar{s}$  in the FVAE, that temporally stable signal properties carry speaker information, is justified, as the computation of  $\mathbf{d}$ , which explicitly uses speaker information, leads to similar results. This is not true for  $y_h$ , which leads to some doubts if  $y_h$  is indeed speaker-dependent.

To identify which components of the speaker vector carry the information about a certain acoustic-phonetic property, we used the trained VR-2 models and estimated the Shapley values of Eq. (4) with kernelSHAP [9]. The Shapley values of 3000 random utterances of the training set are estimated. Figure 2 displays the mean absolute Shapley values for each component of the 64-dimensional speaker vector  $\bar{s}$  for the prediction of the mean pitch and the Hammarberg index, normalized such that its overall sum is 1. What is most striking from this result, is, that the information about the investigated acoustic-phonetic property is pretty much spread out over the components of the speaker embedding vector. The speaker vector lacks in compactness and modularity [25, 26], where compactness refers to the dispersion of information across dimensions and modularity assessing the encapsulation of acoustic signal properties within a single dimension.

## 4.2 Voice Quality Prediction

In light of the very limited training set size, we used 4-fold cross validation for the prediction of the binary voice quality features. We divided the folds in such a way, that

Model	F1-Score [%]					
	Gender		Nasality		Hoarseness	
	$\bar{s}$	$\mathbf{d}$	$\bar{s}$	$\mathbf{d}$	$\bar{s}$	$\mathbf{d}$
SVC	99	100	63	62	56	59
LDA	99	100	63	59	55	56
RF	99	99	58	61	56	56

**Table 2:** F1-score of classifiers to predict voice qualities by using the information of the speaker embedding  $\bar{s}$  or d-vector  $\mathbf{d}$ . NSC corpus is used for training.

there were the same number of speakers with the presence and with the absence of the voice quality category in each set. Table 2 shows the F1-score of the classifiers, averaged over all folds. For comparison purposes we also added the performance of a gender classifier trained on the same input features. The results show that all classifiers, be it with  $\bar{s}$  or  $\mathbf{d}$  at its input, were able to very reliably predict the gender of the speaker, whereas the voice quality classifiers are hardly better than guessing. To put these results into perspective, in [27] experiments are reported on predicting hoarseness using six carefully selected acoustic-phonetic signal properties (F0, intensity, CPPS, F2 and spectral slope measures) that were computed on certain vowel realizations, which were found by forced aligned segments of the input speech. Since the same data set was used as in our study, their results, which had been obtained with a RF classifier, can be readily compared with the results obtained here. They reported an F1-score of 0.87, which is much higher. This clearly shows that a global speaker embedding, as it is computed by the FVAE or the d-vector extractor, does not capture voice quality aspects well, despite the fact that we here tested voice quality categories that are considered to be temporally persistent and speaker-dependent.

## 5 Conclusions and Outlook

In this work, we examined the ability of the speaker embedding vectors of the FVAE and a d-vector extractor to capture acoustic-phonetic signal properties and voice quality aspects. It was observed that the tested acoustic features that are known to be speaker-specific, could be fairly well predicted from the speaker embedding vector, while the more abstract voice quality categories hoarseness and nasality could not. This result asks for a more elaborated way of estimating the speaker embedding. Future work should replace the GAP in the FVAE by more sophisticated pooling operations, such as attention, to focus on those segments of the speech that are most informative of a certain voice quality feature. Further, we employed the concept of Shapley values to determine the attribution of embedding vector components to the prediction results. It was shown that the acoustic signal properties are not disentangled in the embedding vector space, which would make it difficult to manipulate one without affecting the other. Nevertheless, the findings reported here give important insights into the properties of speaker embedding vectors.

## Acknowledgement

Funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation): TRR 318/1 2021-438445824.

## References

- [1] E. Variani, X. Lei, E. McDermott, I. L. Moreno, and J. Gonzalez-Dominguez, “Deep neural networks for small footprint text-dependent speaker verification,” in *2014 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pp. 4052–4056, 2014.
- [2] D. Snyder, D. Garcia-Romero, G. Sell, D. Povey, and S. Khudanpur, “X-vectors: Robust dnn embeddings for speaker recognition,” in *2018 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pp. 5329–5333, 2018.
- [3] K. Qian, Y. Zhang, S. Chang, X. Yang, and M. Hasegawa-Johnson, “AutoVC: Zero-shot voice style transfer with only autoencoder loss,” in *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning (K. Chaudhuri and R. Salakhutdinov, eds.)*, vol. 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 5210–5219, PMLR, 09–15 Jun 2019.
- [4] J.-C. Chou and H.-Y. Lee, “One-shot voice conversion by separating speaker and content representations with instance normalization,” *Proceedings of Interspeech 2019*, pp. 664–668, 2019.
- [5] W.-N. Hsu, Y. Zhang, and J. Glass, “Unsupervised learning of disentangled and interpretable representations from sequential data,” in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pp. 1878–1889, 2017.
- [6] J. Ebberts, M. Kuhlmann, T. Cord-Landwehr, and R. Haeb-Umbach, “Contrastive predictive coding supported factorized variational autoencoder for unsupervised learning of disentangled speech representations,” *IEEE*, 2021.
- [7] B. Sisman, J. Yamagishi, S. King, and H. Li, “An overview of voice conversion and its challenges: From statistical modeling to deep learning,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 29, pp. 132–157, 2021.
- [8] L. S. Shapley *et al.*, “A value for n-person games,” 1953.
- [9] S. M. Lundberg and S.-I. Lee, “A unified approach to interpreting model predictions,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [10] A. Holzinger, A. Saranti, C. Molnar, P. Biecek, and W. Samek, “Explainable ai methods-a brief overview,” in *xxAI-Beyond Explainable AI: International Workshop, Held in Conjunction with ICML 2020, July 18, 2020, Vienna, Austria, Revised and Extended Papers*, pp. 13–38, Springer, 2022.
- [11] S. Sivasankaran, E. Vincent, and D. Fohr, “Explaining Deep Learning Models for Speech Enhancement,” in *Proc. Interspeech 2021*, pp. 696–700, 2021.
- [12] K. Markert, R. Parracone, M. Kulakov, P. Sperl, C. Kao, and K. Böttinger, “Visualizing automatic speech recognition - means for a better understanding?,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2202.00673, 2022.
- [13] F. Rautenberg, M. Kuhlmann, J. Ebberts, J. Wiechmann, F. Seebauer, P. Wagner, and R. Haeb-Umbach, “Speech disentanglement for analysis and modification of acoustic and perceptual speaker characteristics,” in *Fortschritte der Akustik - DAGA 2023*, pp. 1409 – 1412, 2023.
- [14] M. Kuhlmann, F. Seebauer, J. Ebberts, P. Wagner, and R. Haeb-Umbach, “Investigation into target speaking rate adaptation for voice conversion,” in *Interspeech 2022*, ISCA, 2022.
- [15] V. Panayotov, G. Chen, D. Povey, and S. Khudanpur, “Librispeech: an asr corpus based on public domain audio books,” in *2015 IEEE international conference on acoustics, speech and signal processing (ICASSP)*, pp. 5206–5210, IEEE, 2015.
- [16] B. Beilharz, X. Sun, S. Karimova, and S. Riezler, “LibriVoxDeEn: A corpus for german-to-english speech translation and german speech recognition,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.07924*, 2019.
- [17] T. Cord-Landwehr, C. Boeddeker, C. Zorila, R. Doddipatla, and R. Haeb-Umbach, “Frame-wise and overlap-robust speaker embeddings for meeting diarization,” in *2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2023.
- [18] A. Nagrani, J. S. Chung, W. Xie, and A. Zisserman, “Voxceleb: Large-scale speaker verification in the wild,” *Computer Speech & Language*, vol. 60, p. 101027, 2020.
- [19] L. F. Gallardo and B. Weiss, “The Nautilus speaker characterization corpus: Speech recordings and labels of speaker characteristics and voice descriptions,” in *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018)*, 2018.
- [20] F. Eyben, “Acoustic features and modelling,” *Real-time Speech and Music Classification by Large Audio Feature Space Extraction*, pp. 9–122, 2016.
- [21] F. Eyben, M. Wöllmer, and B. Schuller, “OpenSMILE: The Munich versatile and fast open-source audio feature extractor,” in *Proceedings of the 18th ACM international conference on Multimedia*, pp. 1459–1462, 2010.
- [22] L. Tamarit, M. Goudbeek, and K. Scherer, “Spectral slope measurements in emotionally expressive speech,” *Proceedings of speech analysis and processing for knowledge discovery*, pp. 169–183, 2008.
- [23] J. Hillenbrand, R. A. Cleveland, and R. L. Erickson, “Acoustic correlates of breathy vocal quality,” *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 769–778, 1994.
- [24] T. Drugman, J. Kane, and C. Gobl, “Data-driven detection and analysis of the patterns of creaky voice,” *Computer Speech & Language*, vol. 28, no. 5, pp. 1233–1253, 2014.
- [25] M.-A. Carbonneau, J. Zaidi, J. Boilard, and G. Gagnon, “Measuring disentanglement: A review of metrics,” *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, pp. 1–15, 2022.
- [26] C. Eastwood and C. K. Williams, “A framework for the quantitative evaluation of disentangled representations,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [27] J. Wiechmann, F. Rautenberg, P. Wagner, and R. Haeb-Umbach, “Acoustic modeling of hoarseness,” in *19. Phonetik und Phonologie im deutschsprachigen Raum (P&P)*, 2023. submitted.