

IMPROVING AUDIO EVENT RECOGNITION WITH CONSISTENCY REGULARIZATION

Shanmuka Sadhu*

Weiran Wang

Dept. of Computer Science
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, NJ, USA
shanmuka.sadhu@rutgers.edu

Dept. of Computer Science
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA, USA
weiran-wang@uiowa.edu

ABSTRACT

Consistency regularization (CR), which enforces agreement between model predictions on augmented views, has found recent benefits in automatic speech recognition [1]. In this paper, we propose the use of consistency regularization for audio event recognition, and demonstrate its effectiveness on AudioSet. With extensive ablation studies for both small ($\sim 20k$) and large ($\sim 1.8M$) supervised training sets, we show that CR brings consistent improvement over supervised baselines which already heavily utilize data augmentation, and CR using stronger augmentation and multiple augmentations leads to additional gain for the small training set. Furthermore, we extend the use of CR into the semi-supervised setup with 20K labeled samples and 1.8M unlabeled samples, and obtain performance improvement over our best model trained on the small set. Our code is available at <https://github.com/shanmukasadhu/ModifiedAudioMAE>

Index Terms— Audio event recognition, consistency regularization, data augmentation

1. INTRODUCTION

Audio Event Recognition (AER) plays a major role in real-world systems, such as wearable devices [2], smart home devices [3], surveillance systems [4–6], and human activity [7, 8]. Many setups, including supervised and self-supervised audio representation learning, have shown significant results on AER datasets. Early success used non pretrained methods [9] [10] and CNNs as a base architecture. Later works built audio-foundational models such as CAV-MAE [11], AudioMAE [12], and CLAP [13], often built on vision transformers (ViTs). Although some later pre-trained work was unimodal [12, 14], increased success was found with audio-visual learning, such as CAV-MAE [11] and EquiAV [15]. Additionally, recent advancements in multimodal models such as Large Audio Language Models (LTU [16], GAMA [2, 17]) highlight the importance of audio encoders for various audio understanding tasks.

CR-CTC [1] is a recently developed technique for supervised ASR, which enforces consistency between frame-level predictions of augmented views, and improves the alignment/timing of the CTC model. In this work, we apply consistency regularization for AER with the AudioMAE architecture [12] on AudioSet, observing consistent improvement. Our contributions include:

- We apply CR to supervised AER and demonstrate consistent improvements on both the small 20k training setup and a large 2M training setup over reproduced baselines.

- Through extensive ablation studies on augmentation methods, we observe that increasing the number of augmentations during training leads to consistent performance gains.
- We further extend the use of CR to the *semi-supervised* setting, where the 20k set is supervised while the 2M set is unlabeled, applying consistency regularization on both and achieving improved performance over the 20k best model.

We achieve an improvement from 37.9 mAP, obtained by a strong baseline [12], to 39.6 mAP on the 20k setup (a 4.5% relative improvement); semi-supervised training further increase the accuracy to 40.1 mAP. On our 2M setup, we observe an 4.9% relative improvement from 44.7 to 46.9 mAP.

2. RELATED WORKS

Consistency regularization (CR): Consistency Regularization has been useful in self-supervised methods, such as SimCLR [18], BYOL [19], MoCo [20] and SimSiam [21], which use different augmented views to learn semantic representations of unlabeled samples. Supervised methods such as RDrop [22] and cosub [23] have demonstrated the advantage of CR by encouraging agreement between model predictions on different augmentations. In the audio domain, CR-CTC [1] uses frame-level KL-Divergence loss between two augmented views of the same clean input, and demonstrate improvement for supervised ASR. For successful application of CR, it is important to study different augmentation techniques to enforce appropriate inductive bias.

Data Augmentation: Data augmentation has been adopted in several modalities to improve model performance in the supervised setting. In computer vision, common augmentations include random cropping, random color distortions, and random Gaussian blur [24]. In this work, we treat input spectrogram as an image and apply vision transformer encoder to it, and find the random erasing technique [25], originally developed in the vision field, to be sometimes useful. In the audio domain, vocal tract length perturbation [26], speed perturbation [27]), and SpecAugment (including Time warping, Time masking, and Frequency Masking) have been proposed.

In this work, we use mixup [28], implemented at the spectrogram level, to create more varieties of audio event combinations and therefore improve generalization.

Masked prediction [29–31], with masking performed either at the input or feature levels, is shown to be a powerful learning paradigm across modalities. In this work, we use the model architecture of AudioMAE [12], and its pre-trained checkpoint (with masked reconstruction loss on AudioSet) as initialization. Following their implementation, we randomly drop 20% of the patches when training the ViT architecture.

*Work done while Shanmuka Sadhu was participating NSF REU Computing for Health and Well-being award #2349121 at the University of Iowa.




Fig. 1. Overall Architecture of our methodology with 2 augmentations.

3. METHODS

3.1. Audio Event Recognition

Audio Event Recognition (AER) is inherently a multi-label problem, i.e., each audio recording can be associated with multiple classes. We use binary cross entropy (BCE) loss for each class to predict its presence. For a training set comprising N samples and C events, the BCE loss is defined as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{BCE}} = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{c=1}^C [y_{i,c} \log(\hat{y}_{i,c}) + (1 - y_{i,c}) \log(1 - \hat{y}_{i,c})] \quad (1)$$

where $y_{i,c} \in \{0, 1\}$ denotes the target label of class c for sample i , and $\hat{y}_{i,c}$ is the predicted probability for class c . Here logits ($\log \hat{y}_{i,c}$) are obtained by adding a linear layer on top of the global representation of the audio, computed with the ViT encoder followed by average pooling in time.

3.2. Consistency Regularization

The intuition behind consistency regularization (CR) is that, by minimizing the KL-Divergence between the model’s probability distributions of 2 augmented views, the model learns to focus on invariant/semantic features.

Suppose x is the input clean spectrogram. We perform 2 independent augmentations on x to get x_1 and x_2 , and apply our model to both x_1 and x_2 to get two prediction probabilities p_1 and p_2 respectively. The CR loss treats each prediction as “pseudo-label” and requires the other prediction to match it, leading to the following cross-entropy loss terms:

$$\mathcal{L}_{p_1 p_2} = sg(p_1) * \log(p_2) - (1 - sg(p_1)) * \log(1 - p_2) \quad (2)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{p_2 p_1} = sg(p_2) * \log(p_1) - (1 - sg(p_2)) * \log(1 - p_1) \quad (3)$$

where $sg(\cdot)$ is the stop-gradient operator. The CR loss function is then defined as the average of the above terms:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{CR}} = \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{L}_{p_1 p_2} + \mathcal{L}_{p_2 p_1}) \quad (4)$$

While the original CR-CTC paper [1] focused on using two augmentations, CR can be extended to multiple views by performing

Consistency Regularization pairwise and averaging. Given k augmentations, we can generalize consistency regularization loss as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{CR}} = \frac{1}{k(k-1)} \sum_{i \neq j} (\mathcal{L}_{p_i p_j} + \mathcal{L}_{p_j p_i}) \quad (5)$$

For supervised learning of AER, the total loss is

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{total}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{BCE}} + \lambda \mathcal{L}_{\text{CR}} \quad (6)$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is a hyper-parameter that controls the consistency regularization strength and is tuned in the ablation study.

We note that the definition of CR loss (4) does not require the ground truth label. This makes it possible to use it on unsupervised data, as we will demonstrate later.

3.3. Augmentations

We now discuss the list of augmentations found to be useful in CR loss, in the same order they are applied in the data pipeline.

Mixup [28]: Mixup is a data-augmentation technique that takes two fbanks features x_1 and x_2 and creates a new sample \hat{x} that is a convex combination of the two; corresponding labels are mixed using the same coefficient to become the label of \hat{x} . Formally, we have

$$\hat{x} = \mu x_1 + (1 - \mu) x_2$$

$$\hat{y} = \mu y_1 + (1 - \mu) y_2$$

where $\mu > 0$ is randomly sampled from a beta distribution. (\hat{x}, \hat{y}) is then used as a new sample for supervised learning, increasing the data diversity.

SpecAugment [32]: SpecAugment is a common augmentation strategy in the audio domain. As illustrated in Figure 2, it performs time-masking (b), frequency-masking (c), and time + frequency-masking (d) on log-mel spectrograms.

Random Erasing [25]: Although Random Erasing is a computer vision augmentation technique, we applied it after SpecAugment. Random Erasing randomly erases a rectangle region in an image with random values. When performing random erasing, scale, aspect ratio, and probability of erasing can be controlled. We only tune the erasing probability in our experiments.




Fig. 2. Illustration of SpecAugment techniques. (a) Original, (b) Time-masked, (c) Frequency-masked, and (d) Time + Frequency Maske, (e) Random Erasing.

4. EXPERIMENTS

4.1. Experimental Setup

AudioSet: AudioSet [33] is a multi-label audio dataset with 2 million audio clips of length 10 seconds, totalling to 5,800 hours. There are two commonly used supervised training sets: AS-20k is class-wise balanced and originally contained 22,176 audio samples [30], and AS-2M is unbalanced and originally had 2,042,985 audio samples. Due to YouTube restrictions, our AS-20k and AS-2M datasets contain 20,550 and 1,783,977 samples, respectively. We use the AS-20k as the small supervised set, and combine the unbalanced and balanced datasets as the large AS-2M training set. Additionally, our test set contains 18,858 samples (while the original AudioSet test set had 20,383 samples [30]). Our development set consists of 18,610 samples and is separate from our training sets.

Baseline: We use the same architecture and pretrained model as AudioMAE. We have reproduced their AS-20k result, but obtained slightly worse results for the large training set since we had less training data ($\sim 200K$ for AS-2M) [12].

Architecture: For the encoder portion of the model (Fig 1), we use 12-layer ViT-B Transformer model. There are a total of 88.9M trainable parameters. We then use the checkpoint provided by AudioMAE [12], which is pre-trained on AudioSet 2M, for fine-tuning. TorchAudio is used to compute Kaldi-compatible fbank features as model input. We use a weighted random sampler for training, which samples a balanced sample per epoch as done by AudioMAE. For the AS-20K setup, we use a batch size of 64, Adam optimizer with learning rate of $1e-3$, and 60 epochs. For AS-2M setup, we use a batch size of 512, learning rate of $2e-4$, and 60 epochs.

Label Set: Evaluation on AudioSet is usually based on 527 classes [10]. However, in view of the label ontology [33], most classes have parent nodes. We add intermediate labels that were located on the path from the root to the original 527 labels. This increases our label count from 527 to 556. While training is performed on 556 classes, evaluation is still calculated on the commonly used 527 classes to stay consistent with related works. Adding these labels provides the model with more fine-grained label information, and we obtain a small improvement in performance: We achieve 35.8 test mAP when training of 527 classes for AS-20k, and 37.9 mAP when training on the intermediate classes as well (shown in Table 4, Baseline with AudioMAE pretraining). **Evaluation Metric:** We use Mean-Average Precision (mAP) averaged over 527 classes, as is commonly done in prior works.

4.2. Supervised training on AS-20K

We now perform an ablation study on the AS-20k to understand the effect of each parameter on our supervised setup.

Consistency Coefficient: We first perform an ablation on the CR loss coefficient λ in (6). All experiments in Table 1 (a) perform

Table 1. Ablation Study for 20k. mAPs are measured on dev set.

a. CR Coefficient λ		b. Mixup Ratio μ	
λ	mAP	Ratio	mAP
0	34.7	0	35.2
1.5	35.7	0.15	35.5
2.0	35.8	0.25	35.7
2.5	35.7	0.5	35.8
3.0	35.5	0.75	35.6

c. Random Erasing		d. # Augmentations	
Prob.	mAP	#	mAP
0	35.8	2	36.0
0.15	35.9	4	35.8
0.25	36.0	6	36.2
0.5	35.8	7	36.0

2 augmentations. A consistency coefficient of 2 resulted in the best results: 35.8 mAP. For comparison, we provided the pure baseline of our architecture on AS-20K (corresponding to $\lambda = 0$); our best coefficient results in a 1.1 mAP increase.

Mixup: For this ablation study, we investigate how much mixup will improve mAP performance. Since we observe $\lambda = 2$ as the best consistency coefficient, we use it for Table 1 (b). In [12], the mixup ratio of 0.5 was used, and we confirm that it is also the optimal for our AS-20k setup, leading to a 0.6 mAP increase compared to not using it. This performance improvement may be due to the model being exposed to a greater variety of event combinations.

Random Erasing: Although Random Erasing is not common in audio, we investigated its performance in our setup. For our Random Erasing ablation, we keep the aspect ratio fixed at (0.3,0.3) and scale fixed to (0.02, 3.3), while changing the probability of random erasing occurring. As shown in Table 1 (c), we observe that a random erasing probability 0.25 gives us a 0.2 mAP improvement, on top of the optimal λ and mixup.

Number of Augmentations: For this experiment, we fix the other 3 parameters to be the best performing based off the previous ablation studies. The original consistency regularization performs KL-Divergence on 2 augmentations, but we find that 6 augmentations resulted in an additional 0.2 mAP improvement for the 20k training setup, as shown in Table 1 (d).

4.3. Supervised training on AS-2M

We perform similar ablation studies for AS-2M as done for AS-20k, except that we keep mixup fixed at 0.5. As seen in Table 2 (a), we obtain a 1.8 mAP improvement with the optimal consistency regularization setup ($\lambda = 1.5$). Unlike AS-20k, we do not observe any increase in performance when using random erasing. Finally, using more than 2 augmentations is not beneficial for AS-2M.

4.4. Semi-supervised learning

Since consistency regularization can be computed without ground-truth labels, we experiment with a semi-supervised setup where we assume the AS-20k data as supervised while the AS-2M data as unsupervised, and apply consistency regularization on both.

Table 2. Ablation Study for AS-2M. mAPs are measured on dev set.

a. CR coefficient λ (no erasing, 2 augmentations)	
λ	mAP
0	44.8
1.0	46.3
1.5	46.6
2.0	46.5
2.5	46.4

b. Random Erasing		c. # of Augmentations	
Prob.	mAP	#	mAP
0	46.6	2	46.6
0.25	46.5	3	46.3
0.5	46.3	4	46.3

Table 3. Ablation Study for Semi-Supervised Setup on unlabeled dataset. mAPs are measured on dev set.

a. Loss Coefficients (w. optimal aug.)		
λ_1	λ_2	mAP
0	2.0	35.8
1	1	36.4
1	1.5	36.6
1	2.0	36.5
1.5	1	36.3
1.5	1.5	36.4

b. Random Erasing (Unsup)		c. Mixup Ratio μ (Unsup)	
Prob.	mAP	Ratio	mAP
0	36.4	0	36.6
0.25	36.6	0.25	36.4
0.5	36.0	0.5	36.4

Our training loss for this setup is

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{semi}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{BCE}(20\text{k})} + \lambda_1 \mathcal{L}_{\text{CR}(20\text{k})} + \lambda_2 \mathcal{L}_{\text{CR}(2\text{M})} \quad (7)$$

where λ_1 is the coefficient for the AS-20k consistency regularization and λ_2 is the coefficient for the AS-2M consistency regularization.

For every training step, 4 times more unlabeled data is used than labeled data. Thus, in 60 epochs we will see the 1.8M unsupervised set around 3 times. We inherit the random erasing and mixup strategy for the 20K supervised portion from Section 4.2. We find the most optimal coefficient setup to be 1.5 for λ_1 and 1.0 for λ_2 , as shown in Table 3 (a), while random erasing and mixup are not applied to unlabeled data. As shown in Table 3 (b) and (c), adding these augmentations to unlabeled data degrades performance. Overall, we achieve 0.4 mAP gain over the best supervised model on AudioSet 20K (cf Table 1).

4.5. Final Results

Table 4 compares our proposed approaches (supervised and semi-supervised) to our baseline as well as other prevalent AER models.

Table 4. Comparison of AER Models. mAPs measured on test set.

Model	AS-20k (mAP)	AS-2M (mAP)
PANNs [10]	27.8	43.1
AST [14]	37.8	48.5
AudioMAE [12]	37.1	47.3
SSLAM [34]	40.9	50.2

With AudioMAE pretraining		
Baseline	37.9	44.7*
Ours, Supervised	39.6	46.9*
Ours, Semi-Supervised		40.1

Without pretraining		
Baseline	17.2	30.9*
Ours, Supervised	19.3	33.5*
Ours, Semi-Supervised		19.9

*Model trained with 1.8M samples rather than 2M training set size.

Our baseline is (reproduced) AudioMAE [12] without consistency regularization. As shown in Table 4 (middle section), starting from the pretrained checkpoint, we obtain 1.7 mAP improvement in the 20k training setup (37.9→39.6). In the 1.8M training setup, we obtain 2.1 mAP improvement over the baseline.

To show that our method is generally useful, even in settings where large-scale pretrained model is not available, we conduct experiments without initializing from pretrained checkpoint but otherwise use the same hyperparameters. In the non-pretrained setups, we also observe significant improvement on both AS-20k (2.1 mAP improvement) and AS-2M (2.6 mAP improvement), as shown in Table 4 (bottom section).

For the semi-supervised setup, we compare against our 20k supervised method. Without pretraining, we see a 0.6 mAP improvement and a 0.5 mAP improvement with pretraining. We conclude that consistency regularization can help in a semi-supervised setup using unlabeled data.

Compared with relevant models listed in Table 4 (top section), it is interesting to note that without pretraining, our model does not outperform PANNs [10], probably due to architectural differences. With pretrained checkpoint, our model achieves competitive performance against those of [14] and [34] which uses similar architectures but different pretraining objectives.

5. CONCLUSION & FUTURE WORK

In this work, we introduce consistency regularization (CR) into audio event recognition through extensive experiments with AS-20k and AS-2M. Additionally, we apply consistency regularization to a semi-supervised setting. Our findings concluded that 1) consistency regularization in supervised and semi-supervised settings demonstrates consistent improvements across training set sizes, with or without pretraining, 2) multiple number of augmentations with CR increases performance on small datasets. We expect our findings to be generalizable to other sequence modeling tasks.

Future Works: With multi-modal models gaining more research focus, Large Audio Language Models (LALM) have room for improvement. We believe that our learned audio representations may lead to further improvements in audio understanding capabilities in LALMs such as LTU [16], SALMONN [35], QWEN-AUDIO [36], and GAMA [17].

6. REFERENCES

- [1] Zengwei Yao, Wei Kang, Xiaoyu Yang, Fangjun Kuang, Liyong Guo, Han Zhu, Zengrui Jin, Zhaoqing Li, Long Lin, and Daniel Povey, “Cr-ctc: Consistency regularization on ctc for improved speech recognition,” in *ICLR*, 2025.
- [2] A. Mishra, Y. Bai, P. Narayanasamy, N. Garg, and N. Roy, “Spatial audio processing with large language model on wearable devices,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.08907*, 2025.
- [3] A. Vafeiadis, K. Votis, D. Giakoumis, D. Tzovaras, L. Chen, and R. Hamzaoui, “Audio-based event recognition system for smart homes,” in *Proc. IEEE SmartWorld*, 2017.
- [4] R. M. Alsina-Pagès, J. Navarro, F. Alías, and M. Hervás, “homesound: Real-time audio event detection based on high performance computing for behaviour and surveillance remote monitoring,” *Sensors*, vol. 17, no. 4, 2017.
- [5] H. Chi et al., “Audio-assisted smart home security monitoring with few samples,” in *Proc. IEEE Global Commun. Conf. (GLOBECOM)*, 2024.
- [6] Mark Daniel Dacer and Junrie Matias, “Smart home security through real-time audio event detection systems using convolutional neural network (cnn),” in *Proc. IEEE ICERA*, 2025.
- [7] A. H. Yuh and S. J. Kang, “Real-time sound event classification for human activity of daily living using deep neural network,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Internet Things (iThings)*, 2021.
- [8] Minhyuk Jung Seokho Chi, Jinwoo Kim, and Kyungjun Min, “Occupant behavior monitoring and emergency event detection in single-person households using deep learning-based sound recognition,” *Building and Environment*, 2020.
- [9] S. Hershey et al., “Cnn architectures for large-scale audio classification,” in *ICASSP*, 2017.
- [10] Q. Kong, Y. Cao, T. Iqbal, Y. Wang, W. Wang, and M. D. Plumbley, “Panns: Large-scale pretrained audio neural networks for audio pattern recognition,” *TASLP*, 2020.
- [11] Y. Gong et al., “Contrastive audio-visual masked autoencoder,” in *ICLR*, 2023.
- [12] Po-Yao Huang, Hu Xu, Juncheng Li, Alexei Baevski, Michael Auli, Wojciech Galuba, Florian Metze, and Christoph Feichtenhofer, “Masked autoencoders that listen,” in *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [13] B. Elizalde, S. Deshmukh, M. Al Ismail, and H. Wang, “Clap learning audio concepts from natural language supervision,” in *ICASSP*, 2023.
- [14] Y. Gong, Y. Chung, and J. R. Glass, “Ast: audio spectrogram transformer,” in *Interspeech*, 2021.
- [15] J. Kim, H. Lee, K. Rho, J. Kim, and J. S. Chung, “Equiav: Leveraging equivariance for audio-visual contrastive learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.09502*, 2024.
- [16] Y. Gong, H. Luo, A. H. Liu, L. Karlinsky, and J. Glass, “Listen, think, and understand,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10790*, 2023.
- [17] S. Ghosh, S. Kumar, A. Seth, C. K. R. Evuru, U. Tyagi, S. Sakshi, et al., “Gamma: A large audio-language model with advanced audio understanding and complex reasoning abilities,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.11768*, 2024.
- [18] Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey Hinton, “A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations,” in *ICML*, 2020.
- [19] Jean-Bastien Grill, Florian Strub, Florent Altché, Corentin Tallec, Pierre Richemond, Elena Buchatskaya, Carl Doersch, Bernardo Avila Pires, Zhaohan Guo, Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, et al., “Bootstrap your own latent: a new approach to self-supervised learning,” in *NeurIPS*, 2020.
- [20] Kaiming He, Haoqi Fan, Yuxin Wu, Saining Xie, and Ross Girshick, “Momentum contrast for unsupervised visual representation learning,” in *CVPR*, 2020.
- [21] Xinlei Chen and Kaiming He, “Exploring simple siamese representation learning,” in *CVPR*, 2021.
- [22] Lijun Wu, Juntao Li, Yue Wang, Qi Meng, Tao Qin, Wei Chen, Min Zhang, and Tie-Yan Liu, “R-drop: Regularized dropout for neural networks,” in *NeurIPS*, 2021.
- [23] Hugo Touvron, Matthieu Cord, Maxime Oquab, Piotr Bojanowski, Jakob Verbeek, and Hervé Jégou, “Co-training 21 submodels for visual recognition,” in *CVPR*, 2023.
- [24] J. Salamon and J. P. Bello, “Deep convolutional neural networks and data augmentation for environmental sound classification,” *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 24, no. 3, 2017.
- [25] Zhun Zhong, Liang Zheng, Guoliang Kang, Shaozi Li, and Yi Yang, “Random erasing data augmentation,” in *AAAI*, 2020.
- [26] Navdeep Jaitly and Geoffrey E. Hinton, “Vocal tract length perturbation (vtlp) improves speech recognition,” in *ICML*, 2013.
- [27] T. Ko, V. Peddinti, D. Povey, and S. Khudanpur, “Audio augmentation for speech recognition,” in *INTERSPEECH*, 2015.
- [28] Hongyi Zhang, Moustapha Cisse, Yann N Dauphin, and David Lopez-Paz, “mixup: Beyond empirical risk minimization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.09412*, 2017.
- [29] J. Devlin, M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova, “Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [30] K. He, X. Chen, S. Xie, Y. Li, P. Dollár, and R. Girshick, “Masked autoencoders are scalable vision learners,” in *CVPR*, 2022.
- [31] W.-N. Hsu, B. Bolte, Y.-H. H. Tsai, K. Lakhotia, R. Salakhutdinov, and A. Mohamed, “Hubert: Self-supervised speech representation learning by masked prediction of hidden units,” *TASLP*, 2021.
- [32] Daniel S. Park, William Chan, Yu Zhang, Chung-Cheng Chiu, Barret Zoph, Ekin D. Cubuk, and Quoc V. Le, “SpecAugment: A simple data augmentation method for automatic speech recognition,” in *INTERSPEECH*, 2019.
- [33] J. F. Gemmeke et al., “Audio set: An ontology and human-labeled dataset for audio events,” in *ICASSP*, 2017.
- [34] T. Alex, S. Atito, A. Mustafa, M. Awais, and P. J. Jackson, “Sslam: Enhancing self-supervised models with audio mixtures for polyphonic soundscapes,” in *ICLR*, 2025.
- [35] Guangzhi Sun Xianzhao Chen Tian Tan Wei Li Lu Lu Zejun MA Changli Tang, Wenyi Yu and Chao Zhang, “Salmonn: Towards generic hearing abilities for large language models,” in *ICML*, 2024.
- [36] Xiaohuan Zhou Qian Yang Shiliang Zhang Zhijie Yan Chang Zhou Yunfei Chu, Jin Xu and Jingren Zhou, “Qwen-audio: Advancing universal audio understanding via unified large-scale audiolanguage models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.07919*, 2023.