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Abstract—Dynamic range compression (DRC) and noise reduction algorithms are commonly used in hearing aids. They are known to have opposite objectives concerning the Signal-to-Noise Ratio (SNR) and to affect negatively the localization performance. Yet, the study of their interaction received few attention. In this work, we improve an existing combined approach of DRC and noise reduction to bridge the gap between the algorithms proposed independently in their respective communities. The proposed solution is then compared to state-of-the-art algorithms thanks to objective criteria assessing the spatial fidelity preservation, the SNR improvement and the output dynamic range reduction. Experimental results show that the standard serial concatenation of noise reduction and DRC stages is unable to improve the SNR and preserve the noise component acoustic characteristics. They suggest that the proposed design restores the noise localization cues and manages to improve the output SNR.

Index Terms—Hearing aids, spatial hearing, beamforming, dynamic range compression

I. INTRODUCTION

Dynamic range compression (DRC) is the main processing in hearing aids for compensating the listener hearing loss. It consists in amplifying quiet sounds and/or attenuating loud ones. To do so, the gain function defining this amplification/attenuation is split into two zones: (i) below a given threshold the input signal is linearly amplified; (ii) above the same threshold the gain follows a linear decreasing function in the dB domain.

Usually, hearing aids compute the left and right DRC gains independently. It has been shown that the difference between the left and right DRC gain distorts the interaural level difference (ILD) which is an important localization cue. It results in a worsening of the localization performance for the listener, which also affects speech understanding [27], [35].

The straightforward strategy to solve this issue is to apply the same DRC gain to both ears. It restores the ILD as well as the localization performance in anechoic environment [36]. However, other experiments failed to replicate this result [14], [16]. Particularly, it has been recently highlighted that the linked DRC fails at preserving the localization performance in reverberant conditions [13]. The authors showed that, in a reverberant environment, the preservation of the ILD is not sufficient to ensure the preservation of the localization cues. Indeed, usually, the DRC acts quickly in order to follow the short-term speech level fluctuations. Therefore, the reverberation tail is considered as a soft speech period which has to be reinforced. The consequence is a lowering of the direct-to-reverberant energy ratio (DRR), leading to more internalization, image source diffusion for the listener as well as more front-back confusion and source localization splitting. The authors further showed by means of a perceptual evaluation that the Interaural Coherence (IC) [11] is an objective criterion which better correlates with the localization performance of the listener.

To address this issue, it has been proposed [12] to prolong the DRC gain computed from the last direct sound period to the reverberation tail in order to preserve the DRR. To do so, in direct sound period, the DRC acts quickly whereas in the segments dominated by reverberant speech, the DRC acts slowly in order to prolong DRC attenuation from the last direct sound dominated period. The authors showed that such a direct-sound-driven DRC is able to restore both IC and localization performance on the horizontal plane in presence of reverberation. However, the design of this algorithm is limited to a specific auditory scenario composed of one speaker with reverberation but without background noise or other interfering speakers. In noisy environment, the DRC is unable to correct the speech dynamic range accurately [29]. Moreover, it reduces the output SNR [6], [29].

This algorithm has been extended to a scenario including background noise [24]. In this work, the authors use a speech presence detector to drive the DRC time constant, in the same way as in [12], where a direct sound detector was used to drive the DRC in noise-free reverberant conditions. The authors also defined explicitly the objectives of an ideal hearing aids system: (i) amplifying the soft-speech segments; (ii) keeping loud-speech segments below the pain level; (iii) avoiding amplification of the noise in speech absence; and (iv) preserving the original noise dynamic range. However, this solution answers only partially to these objectives. Indeed, the DRC gain applied on a noise-only segment is set according to the one computed on the last frame where speech was detected. As a consequence, the DRC gain highly differs from one noise-only segment to another. This effect is illustrated in Figure 1, where we can observe that the DRC gain on noise-only segments varies from -20 dB at 1.8 s to -12 dB at 3 s,
depending on the DRC at preceding speech frames. It should be noted that this gain is frequency dependent. Therefore, at each speech-absence period, the frequency response of the filter applied to the noise segment differs in an uncontrolled way.

So far, we presented studies considering the DRC as the unique processing in hearing aids. However, an extensive work has been done in the last two decades to improve SNR in hearing aids [20], [30] before applying DRC. Speech enhancement based on beamforming techniques [8] have become the reference and are nowadays commonly used in commercial hearing aids. State-of-the-art noise reduction algorithms such as the Minimum Variance Distortionless Response (MVDR) beamformer and the Multichannel Wiener Filter (MWF) have the particularity of collapsing all the localization cues present in the auditory scene toward the steering direction. Therefore, the preservation of both speech and noise localization cues through the noise reduction stage has attracted a lot of attention in the last decade [18], [21], [22], [34] and is still an open issue. The IC has also been introduced in this research field both as an assessment criterion of the noise localization cues preservation and as a penalty term in beamforming optimization problems [23]. A common strategy to preserve localization cues consists in mixing the beamformer output with the original noisy signal at a reference microphone. It is called multichannel Wiener filtering with partial noise estimation (MWF-N) [33]. Localization performance in the horizontal plane can be restored with an appropriate gain for mixing the enhanced speech signal with the noisy one [22], [32], [33].

In the literature, we observed that noise reduction with beamforming and DRC are treated as two separate research topics, even though they correspond to two key elements of hearing aids. Only very few works studied their interaction and the consequence of their combination on localization and speech understanding performance [5], [17], [26]. Yet, it has been pointed out that noise reduction and DRC have antagonistic objectives [26]: the noise reduction stage aims to reduce the background noise while the DRC amplifies soft sounds and keeps loud sounds below the pain level. In other words, after lowering the noise level thanks to the noise reduction stage, the DRC increases it further. Therefore, it was proposed in [26] to extract both speech and noise signals from the input mixture using beamforming, then apply a DRC independently to each signal before mixing them back to obtain the final enhanced signal. The noise reintroduction level in this final mixing operation is quite low (about -10 dB), therefore residual interfering noise in the estimated speech signal from the beamformer can greatly affect the final noise level in the output mixture.

In this study, the authors only considered a monaural hearing aid system (a two microphones Behind-The-Ear (BTE) device), thus limiting the SNR improvement. Moreover, they did not make the link between their method and the MWF-N beamformer, and they did not assess their algorithm with respect to the localization cues preservation. Finally, their algorithm does not allow for the use of different time constants to process the noise and the speech, even though the above-mentioned studies suggest that it is relevant.

In this study, we propose to adapt the combined beamforming and DRC system from [26] with respect to the recent findings [12], [24]. Then, we add to the four aims of an ideal hearing aids system from [24] another one addressing the localization cues preservation. We rewrite them as follows:

1) reducing the speech dynamic range;
2) preserving the original noise dynamic range;
3) improving the output SNR;
4) preserving the localization cues of both speech and noise.

Each objectives will be assessed thanks to standard objective criteria.

The document is structured as follows: first, the data model is depicted in section II and the proposed algorithm is presented in section III. Then, it will be assessed and compared to the aforementioned algorithms in the section IV.

II. DATA MODEL

We consider an auditory scene composed of one speech source of interest denoted \( s(t) \) and a spatially diffuse noise denoted \( n_m(t) \), where \( m \in \{1, ..., M\} \) is the microphone index, and \( t \) is the discrete-time index. The signal received at microphone \( m \) is expressed as follows:

\[
x_m(t) = (h_m * s)(t) + n_m(t),
\]

where \( * \) denotes the convolution operator, and \( h_m(t) \) is the impulse response of the acoustic channel from the speaker to \( m \)th microphone. It can be expressed in the Short-Term Fourier Transform (STFT) domain. Assuming that \( h_m(t) \) is short compared with the STFT analysis window, convolution in the time domain becomes a simple product in the STFT domain [2]:

\[
x_m(k, \ell) = h_m(k) \ s(k, \ell) + n_m(k, \ell),
\]
where $k$ and $\ell$ denote the frequency and frame indices, respectively. It is convenient, for the following, to consider this equation in the vector form by concatenating the terms related to the microphones: 
\[
\mathbf{x}(k, \ell) = \mathbf{h}(k) \cdot s(k, \ell) + \mathbf{n}(k, \ell),
\] (3)
where $\mathbf{x}(k, \ell) = [x_1(k, \ell), x_2(k, \ell), \ldots, x_M(k, \ell)]^T \in \mathbb{C}^M$, $\mathbf{h}(k) \in \mathbb{C}^M$ and $\mathbf{n}(k, \ell) \in \mathbb{C}^M$ are defined similarly.

Both speech and noise DFT coefficients are modeled as random variables following a zero mean isotropic complex Gaussian distribution of variances $\phi_s(k, \ell)$ and $\phi_n(k, \ell)$, respectively, and the noise is assumed to be spatially diffuse:
\[
s(k, \ell) \sim \mathcal{N}_c(0, \phi_s(k, \ell)) \tag{4}
\]
\[
n(k, \ell) \sim \mathcal{N}_c(0, \phi_n(k, \ell)\mathbf{\Gamma}_{\text{diff}}(k)) \tag{5}
\]
where $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{\text{diff}}(k) \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times M}$ is the spatial coherence matrix corresponding to a diffuse noise field.

In addition, let us assume that the noise is always present while the speech can be present or absent. It leads to the following two mutually exclusive hypotheses $\mathcal{H}_0$ and $\mathcal{H}_1$:

- $\mathcal{H}_0 : \mathbf{x}(k, \ell) = \mathbf{n}(k, \ell)$;
- $\mathcal{H}_1 : \mathbf{x}(k, \ell) = \mathbf{h}(k)s(k, \ell) + \mathbf{n}(k, \ell)$.

Moreover, we consider an anechoic scenario (i.e. without reverberation) where the acoustic transfer functions $\mathbf{h}(k)$ are assumed to be known.

### III. Proposed Algorithm

Our objective is to apply an independent DRC on the speech and noise signals, while improving the SNR and preserving the localization cues of both speech and noise. We derive an algorithm close to the proposition of Ngo et al. [26]. Our approach differs in some points because the data model is not exactly the same. These differences will be detailed in the following. A schematic overview of the proposed algorithm is provided in Figure 2. It incorporates three main stages that we are going to detail in this section: (i) target speech and noise separation with beamforming; (ii) speech presence probability estimation; and (iii) dynamic range compression.

#### A. Source separation

The source separation algorithm is based on a MWF. It consists in estimating the target speech signal at the left ear reference microphone $s_L(k, \ell) = h_L(k) \cdot s(k, \ell)$ by a linear combination of the microphone signals in the STFT domain:
\[
\hat{s}_L(k, \ell) = \mathbf{w}_L(k, \ell) \cdot \mathbf{x}(k, \ell), \tag{6}
\]
where $\hat{s}_L(k, \ell)$ is the speech estimate at the left-ear reference microphone, $\mathbf{w}_L(k, \ell) \in \mathbb{C}^M$ is an estimate of the unknown coefficients (or weights) of the beamformer, and $^H$ denotes the Hermitian transpose. The speech signal estimate at the right ear $\hat{s}_R(k, \ell)$ is defined similarly and for the sake of brevity, only the left expression will be derived in the following.

The beamformer weights are estimated by solving an optimization problem [8]. For the MWF beamformer, it consists in minimizing the mean square error between the true signal and its estimate:
\[
\mathbf{w}_L(k, \ell) = \arg\min_{\mathbf{w}} \{J_1(\mathbf{w})\}, \tag{7}
\]
where
\[
J_1(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbb{E} \left[ |s_L(k, \ell) - \mathbf{w}^H \cdot \mathbf{x}(k, \ell)|^2 \right]. \tag{8}
\]
We use an alternative formulation from [26] called MWF-Flex, which leverages an estimate of the speech presence probability (SPP). The corresponding cost function $J_1(\mathbf{w}_L(k, \ell))$ can be split into several terms, allowing us to set a speech distortion weight depending on whether the speech is present or not:
\[
J_2(\mathbf{w}) = P(\ell) \cdot p(k, \ell) \mathbb{E} \left[ |s_L(k, \ell) - \mathbf{w}^H \cdot \mathbf{x}(k, \ell)|^2 \right | \mathcal{H}_1] \nonumber \\
+ (1 - P(\ell)) \mathbb{E} \left[ |\mathbf{w}^H \cdot \mathbf{x}(k, \ell)|^2 \right | \mathcal{H}_0] \nonumber \\
+ (1 - P(\ell)) \mu_{\mathcal{H}_0} \mathbb{E} \left[ |\mathbf{w}^H \cdot \mathbf{x}(k, \ell)|^2 \right ] \tag{9}
\]
where $P(\ell) \in [0, 1]$ is the broadband speech presence probability, $p(k, \ell) \in [0, 1]$ the narrowband speech presence probability and $\mu_{\mathcal{H}_0} \in \mathbb{R}$ is the attenuation to be applied of the speech component during the speech absence period.

The minimizer of (9) is given by [26]:
\[
\mathbf{w}_L(k, \ell) = (\phi_s(k, \ell) \mathbf{h}(k) \mathbf{h}(k)^H + \mu(k, \ell) \mathbf{\Phi}_{\text{nn}}(k, \ell))^{-1} \nonumber \\
\times \mathbf{h}(k) \phi_s(k, \ell) h_L(k)^*, \tag{10}
\]
where $\mathbf{\Phi}_{\text{nn}}(k, \ell) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{n}(k, \ell) \mathbf{n}(k, \ell)^H \right ] = \phi_n(k, \ell) \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\text{diff}}(k)$, the operator $^*$ denotes the complex conjugate, and
\[
\mu(k, \ell) = P(\ell) \frac{1}{p(k, \ell)} + (1 - P(\ell)) \mu_{\mathcal{H}_0}. \tag{11}
\]

This solution can be decomposed into a Minimum Variance Distorsionless (MVDR) beamforming filter $\mathbf{w}_{\text{MVDR}}$, a parametric Wiener filter $\mathbf{w}_{\text{WF}}$ and a spatialization filter $h_L^\star$ [3]:
\[
\mathbf{w}_L(k, \ell) = \mathbf{w}_{\text{WF}}(k, \ell) \cdot \mathbf{w}_{\text{MVDR}}(k) \cdot h_L(k)^*, \tag{12}
\]
where
\[
\mathbf{w}_{\text{WF}}(k, \ell) = \frac{\xi(k, \ell)}{\mu(k, \ell) + \xi(k, \ell)}, \tag{13}
\]
and $\xi(k, \ell)$ is the a priori SNR at the MVDR beamformer output, defined by:
\[
\xi(k, \ell) = \frac{\phi_s(k, \ell)}{\phi_n(k, \ell) \mathbf{w}_{\text{MVDR}}(k) \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\text{diff}}(k) \mathbf{w}_{\text{MVDR}}(k)}. \tag{14}
\]
As we assume a spatially diffuse noise, the MVDR beamformer turns into a maximum directivity index one [31]:
\[
\mathbf{w}_{\text{MVDR}}(k) = \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\text{diff}}(k)^{-1} \mathbf{h}(k) \frac{1}{\mathbf{h}(k)^H \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\text{diff}}(k) \mathbf{h}(k)}. \tag{15}
\]
Assuming a time-independent noise spatial coherence matrix makes the beamformer no longer time dependent. The diffuse
noise coherence matrix is defined as the mean of the contribution of \( D \) acoustic transfer functions uniformly spaced on the horizontal planes:

\[
\Gamma_{\text{diff}}(k) = \frac{1}{D} \sum_{d=1}^{D} h_d(k) h_d(k)^H
\]  

(16)

where \( h_d \) is the anechoic transfer functions from the \( d^{th} \) direction.

The left ear noise estimate, \( \hat{n}_L(k, \ell) \), can be derived in a similar way leading to:

\[
\hat{n}_L(k, \ell) = x_L(k, \ell) - \hat{s}_L(k, \ell),
\]  

(17)

where \( x_L(k, \ell) \) is the microphone signal used as a reference for the left ear.

Our implementation of the MWF-Flex differs from [26] because the data model is not exactly the same. In this study, the authors do not assume the \textit{a priori} knowledge of \( h \) and that the noise is spatially diffuse. Therefore, they have to estimate the speech and noise covariance matrices which is difficult and not robust in presence of reverberation. Moreover, it allows us to steer in an arbitrary direction \textit{i.e.} selecting the desired target rather than steering in an uncontrolled direction based on the speech covariance matrix estimation. This is also an advantage for the speech presence probability estimation presented in the following.

B. Dynamic range compression

In this subsection, we start by describing the general operation of the DRC used in this work and then we will describe how the DRCs are arranged in our algorithm.

The DRC consists in filtering the input signal by a gain \( g(k, \ell) \in \mathbb{R} \) depending on its input level. To do so, the input signal is passed through a rectangular filterbank and the instantaneous power of each band is computed. The resulting power is filtered with a first order recursive low-pass filter with time constants depending on whether the input signal is in a rising period (attack) or in a falling one (release). The release time constant is usually greater than the attack one. The resulting signal envelop is expressed in dB and is denoted by \( \tilde{P}^{\text{dB}}(\ell) \) in the following, where \( b \) denotes the frequency bands associated with the above-mentioned filter bank.

The DRC gain expressed in dB is defined as follows for the \( b^{th} \) frequency band:

\[
G_b(\ell) = \begin{cases} 
G_0 + \left( \tilde{P}^{\text{dB}}(\ell) - T \right) \left( \frac{1}{R} - 1 \right) & \text{if } \tilde{P}^{\text{dB}}(\ell) > T \\
G_0 & \text{otherwise,}
\end{cases}
\]  

(18)

where \( T \) is the compression threshold, \( G_0 \) a constant gain, and \( R \) is the compression ratio. Then, the gain is brought back into the linear domain and passed through the inverse filterbank.

The drawback of the serial concatenation of the noise reduction stage and the fast-acting DRC is that the latter reduces the SNR improvement achieved by the former. Therefore, it has been proposed in [26] to use three DRCs in parallel, and to switch from one to another depending on whether the speech is active or not:

- "DRC_s" refers to the DRC applied when the speech is present at this time-frequency point.
- "DRC_n \ H_1" refers to the DRC applied when the speech is active in the frame but not at this time-frequency point.
- and, "DRC_n \ H_0" refers to the DRC applied when the speech is absent of the frame.

A drawback of the original implementation of a such DRC combination in [26] is the impossibility of using different smoothing time constants for each DRC. Indeed, in the authors’ implementation the attack/release smoothing is performed on the final DRC gain in the dB domain. Maybe even more problematic, the attack time constant is used to smooth the gain both for the rising speech periods and for the transition between an active speech period and a noise-dominated one. The issue is similar for the release time constant.

In this work, we propose a different implementation by combining the DRC gains in the linear domain rather than in the dB domain, and by low-pass filtering of the input power envelop rather than of the output gain in dB:

\[
g(k, \ell) = P(\ell) [p(k, \ell) g_s(k, \ell) + (1 - p(k, \ell)) g_{H_1}(k, \ell)] + (1 - P(\ell)) g_{H_0}(k, \ell)
\]  

(19)
where \( g_s(k, \ell) \), \( g_{\text{th}}(k, \ell) \) and \( g_{\text{BB}}(k, \ell) \) are the gains associated to “DRC", “DRC", “DRC", and “DRC", respectively. It gives us more flexibility and consistency with the standard DRC designs used in hearing aids [13], [15], [24].

### C. Speech presence probability estimation

The source separation algorithm, as well as the DRCs presented previously, involve the knowledge of the narrow-band and broadband speech presence probabilities \( p(k, \ell) \) and \( P(\ell) \). In this subsection, we detail how the speech presence parameters are estimated. To do so, we use the two hypotheses, \( H_0 \) and \( H_1 \), presented in Section II.

Using the Bayes theorem, the \emph{a posteriori} speech presence probability, denoted by \( p(k, \ell) = P(H_1|x(k, \ell)) \), can be expressed as follows [28]:

\[
p(k, \ell) = \frac{q(k, \ell)}{1 + q(k, \ell)(1 + \zeta(k, \ell))e^{-\frac{\beta(k, \ell)}{\alpha(k, \ell)}}}^{-1}
\]  

where \( q(k, \ell) = P(H_0) \) is the \emph{a priori} speech absence probability, estimated recursively as in [4], \( \zeta(k, \ell) \) is similar to the SNR:

\[
\zeta(k, \ell) = \frac{\phi_s(k, \ell)}{\phi_n(k, \ell)} \text{Tr} \left\{ \Gamma_{\text{diff}}(k)^{-1}h(k)h(k)^H \right\},
\]

with \( \text{Tr}\{.\} \) the trace operator, and finally

\[
\beta(k, \ell) = x(k, \ell)^H \Gamma_{\text{diff}}(k)^{-1}h(k)h(k)^H \Gamma_{\text{diff}}(k)^{-1}x(k, \ell) \\
\times \phi_s(k, \ell).
\]

The speech and noise variances estimates, denoted by \( \hat{\phi}_s(k, \ell) \) and \( \hat{\phi}_n(k, \ell) \) respectively, are defined as follows [10]:

\[
\hat{\phi}_s(k, \ell) = w_{\text{MVDR}}(k)^H \left( \hat{\Phi}_{xx}(k, \ell) - \hat{\phi}_n(k, \ell) \Gamma_{\text{diff}}(k) \right) \\
\times w_{\text{MVDR}}(k)
\]

\[
\hat{\phi}_n(k, \ell) = \frac{1}{M-1} \text{Tr} \left\{ P(k)\hat{\Phi}_{xx}(k, \ell) \Gamma_{\text{diff}}(k)^{-1} \right\}
\]

where \( P(k) = I - h(k)w_{\text{MVDR}}(k)^H \) with \( I \) the identity matrix of size \( M \). The input data covariance estimate \( \hat{\Phi}_{xx}(k, \ell) \) is computed thanks to a recursive filter:

\[
\hat{\Phi}_{xx}(k, \ell) = \alpha x(k, \ell) x(k, \ell)^H + (1 - \alpha)\hat{\Phi}_{xx}(k, \ell - 1)
\]

where \( \alpha \) is the smoothing factor.

The broadband speech presence detection, \( P(\ell) \), is computed thanks to a hysteresis comparator with adaptive thresholds:

\[
P(\ell) = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } \sum_k p(k, \ell) > t_{\text{high}} \text{ and } P(\ell - 1) = 0 \\
0 & \text{if } \sum_k p(k, \ell) > t_{\text{low}} \text{ and } P(\ell - 1) = 1 \\
P(\ell - 1) & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

where \( t_{\text{low}} \) and \( t_{\text{high}} \) are computed by means of a one-dimensional 2-means clustering algorithm over the \( p(k, \ell) \) for the \( L \) last frames. Finally, \( P(\ell) \) is smoothed with a recursive first order low-pass filter with attack and release time constants to avoid the gate effect due to the DRC gain between speech+noise and noise-only segments.

### IV. Evaluation

In this section, we assess the proposed algorithm according to the different objectives defined in the introduction. For each objective, a standard objective criterion is associated and the performance are compared to reference algorithms we already presented in the introduction. First, we will depict the reference algorithms implementation. Second, we will present the experimental set-up and, third, the assessment criteria will be detailed. Finally, the results will be presented. The audio examples for the first subject are available online.

#### A. Reference algorithms

Firstly, the unprocessed signal is considered as a reference and is called the \emph{linear} condition. The \emph{independent} and \emph{linked} conditions refer to a DRC applied to the left and right ears microphones, independently or not, respectively. For the \emph{linked} condition, the DRC gains are computed independently for each ear and the minimum gain is applied to both. The filterbank is a rectangular octave-spaced one from 125 to 8 kHz. The SNR-aware DRC proposed in [24] is also tested and called \emph{May18}. This algorithm consists in using a different set of attack/release time constants depending on whether the speech is active or not in the frame. In [24], the authors use another data model leading to a different SPP estimation algorithm than the one presented in section III-C. For the sake of data model consistency, we use the latter. The \emph{MWF-N+DRC} consists in the serial concatenation of a MWF-N [33] and a DRC. The MWF-N consists in a weighted sum between the MWF output and the left (or right) reference microphone. It achieves a trade-off between noise reduction and preservation of the noise localization cues [34]. The MWF is implemented as a concatenation of a fixed MVDR beamformer (see (15)) and a Wiener filter [3]. The trade-off parameter is set to 0.3 (noise reintroduction gain of -10 dB) in order to maximize the IC [22]. Finally, the \emph{ideal} condition consists in applying the DRC to the speech sentence before spatialization [13] and mixed the DRC output signals with a gain difference of 10 dB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency (Hz)</th>
<th>125</th>
<th>250</th>
<th>500</th>
<th>1k</th>
<th>2k</th>
<th>4k</th>
<th>8k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Threshold (dBAlr.)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRC</th>
<th>Attack (ms)</th>
<th>Release (ms)</th>
<th>Gain G_{\text{D}} (dB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRC _n</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC _H</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC _H</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC _n</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\text{Audio examples repository URL: } https://a-llave.github.io/demo_apsipa2020\)
B. Experiment set-up

The auditory scene is simulated thanks to a 4 s-long male speech sentence recording from the France Culture radio station and a mono cafeteria recording. We use the first fourteen BTE hearing aids anechoic HRTF from the OTIMP database [25] (front and back microphones, $M = 4$) resulting in as many stimuli. The noise stimulus is built from the mono cafeteria recording. It is cut into 4 s pieces and spatialized through virtual loudspeakers thanks to the BTE HRIR. The loudspeakers are arranged in two rings at ±45° of elevation with a horizontal resolution of 22.5°. The speech stimulus is placed at the frontal direction and presented at 75 dB SPL and the SNR is equal to 5 dB. The tested algorithms are embedded into an overlap-add framework with a 128 samples (8 ms) long frame and 50 % overlap. The analysis and synthesis windows are the square root of a Hann function and the sampling frequency is 16 kHz. The DRC settings used in this work are the same as in [13] and are summarized in the table I. The low-pass filter time constant used in (25) for the estimation of $\Phi_{xx}$ is 9 ms and the broadband speech presence detection $P(\ell)$ is smoothed with a similar recursive filter with attack and release time constants of 2 ms and 20 ms, respectively. The DRC thresholds and ratios for each frequency bands are set as in [13] and are summarized in Tab. I. The overall gain for each DRC as well as the time constants used for the power envelop estimation are gathered in Tab. II.

C. Assessment criteria

1) Signal-to-Noise Ratio improvement: For a source $s(t)$ and a noise $n(t)$, the SNR, in dB, is defined as follows:

$$SNR = 10 \log_{10} \frac{\sum_{t=0}^{N-1} s(t)^2}{\sum_{t=0}^{N-1} n(t)^2}$$  (27)

where $N$ is the total number of samples in the time domain. Only the periods where the speech is active are considered. The SNR improvement ($\Delta SNR$) is defined as the difference between the output SNR and the linear condition one.

For each condition, the required processing parameters are computed from the noisy speech recording. The resulting filters are applied to the mixed $x(k, \ell)$ as well as the speech and noise components separately. It allows us to compute the true output SNR. This method is sometimes called the shadow-filtering [24] in the literature.

2) Interaural Coherence: The IC is used to assess the perception of the width of the auditory scene [19] and is known to be important to access to the localization cues [7]. It is defined as the absolute maximum value of the normalized cross-correlation between the left and right band-pass filtered output signals, denoted by $\tilde{y}_L$ and $\tilde{y}_R$ with $|\tau| \leq 1$ ms [11], [13]:

$$IC = \max_{\tau} \left| \frac{\sum_t \tilde{y}_L(t + \tau)\tilde{y}_R(t)}{\sqrt{\sum_t |\tilde{y}_L(t)|^2 \sum_t |\tilde{y}_R(t)|^2}} \right|.$$  (28)

The hearing aids output signals $y_{L}(t)$ and $y_{R}(t)$ are passed through a filterbank modeling the auditory system composed

---

**Fig. 3.** The SNR improvement ($\Delta SNR$), speech and noise Effective Compression Ratio (ECR) and Interaural Coherence (IC) for each conditions. The box limits represent the 1st and 3rd quartiles of the subjects results, the orange line indicates the median, the Whiskers show the data range up to 1.5 times the interquartile distance, and circles show outliers.
of fourth order gammatone filters with equivalent rectangular bandwidth spacing [9].

3) Effective Compression Ratio: The ECR is the ratio between the dynamic range in input and output. The dynamic range is computed by slicing the signal in short frames of 10 ms, computing the power (in dB) of each ones, and then, taking the levels standard deviation [1]. This metric is computed for each frequency channel and finally averaged across the frequencies.

D. Results and discussion

In this section, we analyze the results of the experiments. The performance of each algorithm is summarized in the Figure 3.

1) SNR improvement: On one hand, as expected, the independent and linked conditions show an SNR lowering greater than 3 dB. This result is consistent with [6], [29]. As for the SNR aware DRC from [24], it manages to contain this effect but still reduces the SNR by 1.5 dB. On the other hand, in the conditions including noise reduction techniques, the SNR is lowered by 1.5 dB for the MWF-N+DRC condition and improved by 3 dB for our proposition. This result suggests that the parallel DRC combination overcomes the antagonistic objectives dichotomy highlighted by Ngo et al. [26] and allows us to reach the target SNR. However, we can see it remains a large room of improvement to reach the ideal performance. This is due to the noise component leakage into the speech branch. This may be improved thanks to a more complex beamformer.

2) Speech and noise ECR: An ECR greater than 1 indicates a reduction of the dynamic range and vice versa. First, we show that all the conditions without noise reduction stage lead to a speech ECR lower than the ideal condition. Taking advantage of beamforming, MWF-N+DRC and our proposition achieve a better compression because the low-level speech segments are no longer mixed up with the background noise but a gap remains compared to the ideal performance, possibly due to speech estimation errors (in high frequency particularly). However, our algorithm failed to improve the speech ECR probably because of speech presence probability estimation errors implying an excessive attenuation of the speech after a silent period. Second, we show that the noise dynamic range is increased (ECR < 1) for all the conditions. Our proposition failed to improve the criterion. However, a part of the noise component is highly correlated with the speech in such a way that it is masked by the latter one. Informal tests suggest that it is not perceived to be as problematic.

3) Interaural Coherence: Firstly, we have to note that the input (linear) and the ideal IC are not equal because the input and ideal SNR are not the same in the experiments. Similarly to the ∆SNR, the conditions without noise reduction stage reduces the IC. As for the MWF-N+DRC, due to the serial concatenation of beamforming and DRC, it fails to increase the IC up to the ideal one. Moreover, the inter-subject variability is particularly important. Finally, our proposition manages to get close to the IC of the ideal condition. More investigation is needed to show if the remaining gap is perceptually important or not.

V. Conclusion

In this study, we considered an auditory scene composed of one speech source and a cafeteria noise (spatially diffuse noise). Firstly, we pointed out that the serial concatenation of beamforming algorithm and DRC fails at improving the SNR, consistently with [26]. Moreover, it fails at preserving the Interaural Coherence (IC) as well as they make the noise comodulates with the speech envelop. Secondly, we proposed an amelioration of an existing algorithm combining DRC and noise reduction in order to increase both the SNR improvement and the spatial fidelity of the auditory scene. We showed that the proposed combined approach reaches the IC target performance and manages to improve the SNR. However, some estimation errors in our algorithm prevent the speech and noise ECR from being improved. These outcomes have to be confirmed thanks to perceptual tests.
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