

# Speech Editing – a Summary

**Tobias Kässmann**  
tobias.kaessmann@kit.edu

**Yining Liu**  
yining.liu9@kit.edu

**Danni Liu**  
danni.liu@kit.edu

## Abstract

With the rise of video production and social media, speech editing has become crucial for creators to address issues like mispronunciations, missing words, or stuttering in audio recordings. This paper explores text-based speech editing methods that modify audio via text transcripts without manual waveform editing. These approaches ensure edited audio is indistinguishable from the original by altering the mel-spectrogram. Recent advancements, such as context-aware prosody correction and advanced attention mechanisms, have improved speech editing quality. This paper reviews state-of-the-art methods, compares key metrics, and examines widely used datasets. The aim is to highlight ongoing issues and inspire further research and innovation in speech editing.

## 1 Introduction

As audio data becomes increasingly prevalent in our daily lives, especially due to the rise of video production and audio sharing on social media platforms like Instagram, speech editing has become a crucial tool for improving creators' efficiency. Issues such as mispronunciations, missing words, or stuttering can disrupt recordings, making speech editing essential to avoid the need for redoing entire recordings (Wang et al., 2023b; Tan et al., 2021). A text-based speech editing approach is particularly beneficial for post-editing audio data using a text transcript (Morrison et al., 2021).

Speech editing involves altering words and phrases based on a text transcript of an audio utterance. This can be achieved by textually deleting or cutting unwanted words and phrases, copying and pasting them to different locations within the text, or even inserting new unseen text, which has to be generated for this purpose into the text-transcript, as illustrated in Figure 1. These changes are then propagated to the audio recording, by altering the mel-spectrogram (Davis and Mermelstein, 1980)




Figure 1: Speech Editing by inpainting (Example Illustration of an additional word getting added that was not present before)

of the original audio, without the need for manual waveform editing (Morrison et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2023b; Yin et al., 2022). The goal is to produce edited audio that is indistinguishable from the original, while ensuring that the original audio fragments remain unchanged (Alexos and Baldi, 2024; Peng et al., 2024).

One major challenge in speech editing is ensuring that the boundaries of the edited regions are seamlessly integrated in terms of prosody<sup>1</sup>. This can be difficult when inserted words or phrases do not match the surrounding context in terms of intonation, stress, rhythm, voice quality, similarity, temporal smoothness, style, or naturalness (Morrison et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2023b; Cámbara et al., 2024; Tan et al., 2021; Tae et al., 2021). Additionally, external factors such as environmental noise or packet loss can affect the quality of the edited audio (Borsos et al., 2022).

Neglected at first, recent methods have also emphasized the importance of stutter removal in speech editing (Jiang et al., 2023). Existing methods often struggle with robustness when dealing with stuttered speech, leading to over-smoothed

<sup>1</sup>the patterns of stress and intonation in a language

outputs that fail to meet quality criteria and do not generalize well to unseen speakers (Borsos et al., 2022; Cámbara et al., 2024; Jiang et al., 2023). Addressing these challenges is essential for developing effective speech editing tools that enhance the quality and naturalness of edited audio.

In order to help with this task, our goal with this paper is to provide a summary of the topic, a comparison of some noteworthy papers, and further insights into the current state of the art. We aim to draw more attention to this research area, encourage more researchers to engage with this topic, and highlight current issues.

## 2 Metrics

Currently, there are many methods used to determine the performance of a speech edit system. The most noteworthy ones include the Mean Opinion Score (MOS), Mel-Cepstral distance measure (MCD), Word Error Rate (WER), Speaker Similarity (SIM) because they are the most commonly used metrics as can be seen in Table 3, that presents a comparison of objective measures, and Table 4 which provides a comparison of subjective measures used in various papers and their results.

### 2.1 MOS

MOS is the most common measure within the speech editing community, as almost every research paper uses it or a variant thereof. MOS is a score that subjectively measures audio quality based on ratings by human listeners (Alexos and Baldi, 2024). The MOS score is calculated by asking human evaluators to rate the audio based on quality criteria on a 1 to 5 Likert scale, where 1 means very unrealistic and 5 means very realistic speech (Le et al., 2023; Tan et al., 2021; Yin et al., 2022; Borsos et al., 2022). According to our own definition, we hereby declare that "realistic" in this context means that the speech is coherent with the context, has the correct textual content, and sounds natural, including pronunciation, intonation, naturalness, and clarity. The arithmetic mean of these ratings is then calculated, with a higher MOS value indicating better quality. It is important to note that MOS is also a recommendation by the International Telecommunication Union (ITU)<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>2</sup><https://www.itu.int/rec/T-REC-P.85/en> – ITU-T Recommendation P.85, 1994. Telephone transmission quality subjective opinion tests. A method for subjective performance assessment of the quality of speech voice output devices

To gather sufficient data, some research papers use Amazon Mechanical Turk (Turk, 2012) like (Bai et al., 2022; Morrison et al., 2021; Jiang et al., 2023). In the case of (Morrison et al., 2021), even a listening test was conducted to assess the hearing capabilities of the testers and to prevent wrong test results.

An issue with the MOS score is that it is not comparable across different papers (Viswanathan and Viswanathan, 2005; Le et al., 2023), leading to the development of various MOS variants, such as similarity MOS (sMOS) (Le et al., 2023; Yin et al., 2022), quality MOS (qMOS) (Le et al., 2023), comparative mean opinion score (cMOS) (Jiang et al., 2023), Dynamic Time Warping (DNMOS) (Reddy et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2023b) or one with a modified scale based on psychometric properties (Viswanathan and Viswanathan, 2005). For instance, (Jiang et al., 2023) employs cMOS, a comparative mean opinion score. (Wang et al., 2023b) uses DNMOs to evaluate noise suppression and target speaker performance, utilizing the overall score from the DNMOs<sup>3</sup> model and a personalized DNMOs model tailored for target speaker performance evaluation.

The similarity MOS (sMOS) used by (Le et al., 2023; Yin et al., 2022) measures subjective audio similarity given pairs of audio, while the qMOS employed by (Le et al., 2023) measures subjective quality.

The sheer number of MOS variants and the subjective nature of MOS call for an automatic measure like MosNet (Lo et al., 2019). However, apart from (Wang et al., 2023b) with the use of DNMOs (Reddy et al., 2021, 2022), automatic measures are not widely used in the speech community, likely due to the complexity of evaluating human voice and the challenges models like MosNet (Lo et al., 2019) still face in evaluation.

### 2.2 MCD

Another rather popular measure is the MCD (Kubichek, 1993a) measure, a common objective metric used by several studies (Alexos and Baldi, 2024; Bai et al., 2022; Tan et al., 2021; Jiang et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023b; Jin et al., 2017). It computes the spectral dissimilarity between two mel-spectrograms (Alexos and Baldi, 2024; Davis and Mermelstein, 1980), where a lower MCD value indicates better speech quality (Tan et al., 2021).

<sup>3</sup>DNMOS P.835

The **MCD** analysis can be performed on three segments: the modified region, the unmodified region, and the entire utterance. However, aside from (Tan et al., 2021), no other study we found has investigated these segments in detail. Most studies compare the synthesized utterance directly to the reference (altered) audio.

Although the **MCD** is widely used in the voice conversion (VC) community to automatically measure the quality of converted speech, it has its limitations. One significant drawback is the lack of correlation with human perception, as the function only measures the distortion of acoustic features and does not capture subjective human judgments (Lo et al., 2019). Another limitation is that it assumes a deterministic output given the input, which is often unrealistic. Therefore, (Le et al., 2023) advocates for other reproducible model-based perceptual metrics.

### 2.3 SIM and WER

In addition to the objective **MCD** measure, other objective measures such as the **WER** and **SIM** are often used within the community to provide additional means of comparing their works.

**SIM** measures the coherence of audio utterances. This is done by calculating the cosine similarity difference between the generated embeddings and the ground truth embeddings of the audio utterances (Cámara et al., 2024; Le et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023a,b; Peng et al., 2024; Kharitonov et al., 2021). There are several ways to generate these embeddings, such as the WavLM-TDCNN embeddings (Chen et al., 2022) used by (Peng et al., 2024; Cámara et al., 2024), NeMo’s TitaNet-Large (Wang et al., 2023b), or the Google Cloud speech-to-text API (Tae et al., 2021).

The Google Cloud speech-to-text API<sup>4</sup> was also used by (Tae et al., 2021) to examine the **WER**, which measures the fidelity of the generated audio with respect to its provided transcription (Wang et al., 2023b). Other papers measured **WER** using the open-sourced Whisper-Medium ASR (Cámara et al., 2024; Radford et al., 2022), HuBERT (Hsu et al., 2021) for English settings. For multilingual settings also Whisper (Radford et al., 2023) can be used as in the works of (Le et al., 2023), or for example the NeMo’s STT En Conformer Transducer Large model, a variant of the model proposed

<sup>4</sup><https://cloud.google.com/speech-to-text/?hl=en>

by (Gulati et al., 2020), as used by (Wang et al., 2023b).

## 2.4 Datasets

Paper	LJSpeech	VCTK	LibriTTS	Additional
AttentionStitch (Alexos and Baldi, 2024)	X	X		
A3T (Bai et al., 2022)	X	X		
Speechpainter (Borsos et al., 2022)		X	X	
Editts (Tae et al., 2021)	X			
EditSpeech (Tan et al., 2021)	X	X		X <sup>1</sup>
FluentSpeech (Jiang et al., 2023)		X	X	X <sup>2</sup>
RetrieverTTS (Yin et al., 2022)			X	
Morrison2021 (Morrison et al., 2021)	X			X <sup>3</sup>

Table 1: Comparison of datasets used by the Speech edit community

1: MST Aishell-3 (Chinese), 2: SASE, 3: The Everyday Life of Abraham Lincoln read by Bill Boerst

Most Researchers within the speech edit community focus on the three main datasets, as depicted in Table 1, namely VCTK (Veaux et al., 2017), a roughly 44h newspaper speech dataset, with recordings from 110 English speakers with various accents. LJSpeech (Ito and Johnson, 2017), a dataset consisting out of 24h short audio clips from a single English speaker as well as LibriTTS (Zen et al., 2019), a roughly 585 hour dataset without significant background noise. The issues with those recordings is, that they only consist out of audiobooks, so (Peng et al., 2024) created REALEDIT, a dataset with diverse content, accents, speaking styles, recording conditions, and background sounds from audiobooks (Zen et al., 2019) YouTube videos (Chen et al., 2021) and Spotify podcasts (Clifton et al., 2020).

## 3 Recent Works

Recent advancements in speech editing technologies have enabled more precise and natural modifications of audio recordings. These innovations address various challenges such as prosody mismatches and unnatural boundary artifacts, which are common issues in speech editing.

### 3.1 VoCo

The VoCo approach, introduced by (Jin et al., 2017), represents an early method in speech editing that generates a generic voice audio using **Text to speech (TTS)** technology. This audio is then morphed to match the target voice to be then integrated into the original audio recording.

However, this method often results in unnatural-sounding audio because the generated audio does not match its context. Consequently, this leads to non-smooth boundary artefacts (Morrison et al.,

2021; Alexos and Baldi, 2024; Peng et al., 2024; Bai et al., 2022; Tan et al., 2021).

### 3.2 Context-Aware Prosody Correction for Text-Based Speech Editing

To address those unnatural boundaries within the edit regions due to the prosody mismatches. (Morrisson et al., 2021) propose using a context-aware method to produce more natural-sounding audio. Their approach utilizes a model based on prior work in neural prosody generation, speech generation, speech manipulation (pitch and time shifting), and speech editing.

First they generate Context-Aware prosody through a series of Neural Network (NN) from the input phonemes. The networks hereby predict phoneme durations and their pitch. then they adjust the prosody features by pitch shifting and time stretching, using the TD-PSOLA (Moulines and Charpentier, 1989) algorithm. Lastly they remove the artefacts resulting from signal manipulation using a denoising hifi-Generative Adversarial Network (GAN) ensuring high-fidelity results.

This comprehensive approach enhances the naturalness of edited speech by addressing prosody mismatches and eliminating artifacts, leading to more seamless audio integration.

### 3.3 SpeechPainter

SpeechPainter, developed by (Borsos et al., 2022), leverages advanced attention mechanisms within its transformer model to seamlessly infill gaps in audio recordings up to one second, maintaining speaker identity, prosody, and recording environment conditions. Additionally, it can generalise to unseen speakers through in-context learning (Peng et al., 2024; Alexos and Baldi, 2024).

The model employs a non-Autoregressive (AR) (non-AR) architecture based on PerceiverIO (Jae-gle et al., 2022) to avoid robotic training artefacts in the second training step. It processes data in the form of a (in training randomly) masked, non-overlapping batched log-mel spectrogram, transformed into a  $1D$  array and concatenated using  $2D$  Fourier positional embeddings. Textual data is padded and transformed into batched  $UTF - 8$  embeddings with added Fourier positional embeddings and two learned modality embeddings appended to both. These inputs are processed as the key/value in the cross-attention encoder, with the query provided by a learned fixed-size latent.

These values are then fed into  $k$  transformer blocks with self-attention. The output of the last self-attention layer is passed to a decoder as key/value, analogous to the encoder, using an output latent. The model then returns a log-mel spectrogram after projecting it to the target spectrogram dimension.

Training was conducted in two phases, both utilising the Adam optimizer. The first phase trains using  $L1$  loss on mel-spectrograms to learn correct identification/inpainting of the content of the gap based on the target transcript, maintaining speaker identity, prosody, and the target environment. However, this creates robotic artefacts, which are removed using adversarial training, thus improving perceptual quality. This is achieved by training a discriminator based on Convolutional Neural Network (CNN)s to learn the representation of original and created mel-spectrograms. The discriminator is trained with a hinge loss, and the model is compared against it to ensure it is not detected as incorrect by the discriminator.

Experiments were conducted using a neural vocoder<sup>5</sup> (MelGAN (Kumar et al., 2019) architecture) trained on a multi-scale reconstruction and adversarial loss of the wave and stat-based discriminators to synthesize the audio from the log-mel spectrograms. No pre-training or transfer learning was used for the reconstruction of the whole sentence from three-second audio samples. The model utilized two feed-forward neural networks (FFNNs) in the attention blocks.

### 3.4 EditSpeech

Models such as the one proposed by EditSpeech (Tan et al., 2021) condition text generation on the surrounding context to maintain naturalness and quality (Bai et al., 2022; Jiang et al., 2023). The method proposed by EditSpeech (Tan et al., 2021) divides the audio into edit and non-edit regions. The non-edit regions are directly copied to the output, while the edit regions are processed using an AR Neural Text-to-Speech (NTTS) model to generate frames in both forward and backward directions to incorporate context. These generated frames are then merged to create fused mel-spectrograms by selecting the best frames based on context information. This bidirectional fusion ensures smooth boundaries on both sides (Tan et al., 2021; Alexos and Baldi, 2024; Peng et al., 2024).

<sup>5</sup>"Voice Coder" - A synthesizer that produces sounds from an analysis of speech input.

This approach improves upon methods like VoCo (Jin et al., 2017), which rely on unit selection speech synthesis, by enabling the generation of arbitrary text based on context without needing additional audio recordings (Tan et al., 2021). However, a drawback of this method is its compatibility only with AR decoding models and its heavy reliance on speaker embeddings, which limits its transferability to new speakers (Bai et al., 2022).

The EditSpeech architecture consists of an acoustic model, a duration predictor, and a vocoder.

The duration predictor forecasts the length of the to-be-inserted sequence based on the edited text. It is trained by minimizing the duration loss between the logs of the ground-truth and the predicted duration. This involves assessing the prediction error and multiplying it by the predicted duration.

The acoustic model employs a text encoder, a speech encoder, a length regulator, a "prenet", and forward and backward decoders. The phone-level text embeddings sequence (obtained by a Grapheme-to-Phoneme (G2P) module) is encoded by the encoder. The length regulator expands text embeddings into frame-level embeddings according to the length prediction, aligning the time frames' position. The prenet preprocesses preceding spectrograms and changes their representation to concatenate with the frame-level hidden representation, which is then fed into the decoders. The decoders consist of one forward and one backward decoder, each comprising two unidirectional Long short-term memory (LSTM)s to synthesize mel-spectrograms. These mel-spectrograms are then stitched together at the point where their frame-level  $L2$  norms differ the least.

The vocoder used by EditSpeech is a HiFi-GAN(Kong et al., 2020) <sup>6</sup>, which creates speech from a mel-spectrogram.

Training involved several steps for all components in batches using the Adam optimizer. Initially, the data was prepared by pairing speech utterances with text transcriptions and speaker identities. Mel-spectrograms were computed from speech utterances using Tacotron2 (Shen et al., 2018) signal processing configurations, and ground-truth phone durations were obtained using an Hidden Markov Model (HMM)-based forced aligner.

Training steps began by concatenating the text embeddings, speaker embeddings, and positional

embeddings to get the frame-level hidden representation. The mel-spectrograms were synthesized by forward and backward decoders by processing preceding frame representations through a prenet and then through unidirectional LSTMs, where the decoders minimized both forward and backward mel-spectrogram loss. The duration predictor was trained by minimizing the duration loss between the logs of the ground-truth and predicted durations. Finally, fusion occurred at the point where the frame-level  $L2$  norms of the forward and backward predicted mel-spectrograms differed the least, marking the transition from forward to backward generation.

Deletion, insertion, and replacement operations were tested with different presets. For deletion, forced alignment located the start and end times of the phones to remove the speech frames in the input mel-spectrogram. For insertion and replacement, users specified the word position for insertion or text replacement. The G2P module processed the original text and replacement text into phone sequences. Forced alignment with the original text determined the duration sequence. The edited phone sequence, duration, and speaker embedding, along with positional embeddings, were then used as input to generate frame-level hidden representations. Forward and backward decoders then synthesized mel-spectrograms, ensuring smooth transitions between edited and non-edited regions.

In general, the system generates mel-spectrograms in partial inference for both forward and backward directions. For unmodified regions, the predicted frame is discarded, and the original frame is fed to the prenet and recurrent decoder for the next frame prediction. For modified regions, the predicted frame is used for subsequent predictions.

### 3.5 A3T

Recently, masked prediction models such as A3T (Bai et al., 2022) have demonstrated improved contextual learning from input mel-spectrograms, significantly enhancing quality and prosody modeling (Jiang et al., 2023).

A3T achieves this by utilizing forced alignment and G2P conversion, similar to EditSpeech (Tan et al., 2021), using the HTK (Young et al., 2006) method and an external English duration predictor based on FastSpeech2 (Ren et al., 2022). The duration predictor, analogous to the one in EditSpeech, predicts the length of the masked segments, taking

<sup>6</sup>UNIVERSAL 1 <https://github.com/jik876/hifi-gan>

into account the ratio of original to edited segments. This ensures the alignment and timing of the generated spectrogram are coherent with the original input. These steps in combination ensure accurate phoneme alignment and duration prediction.

The model uses cross-modal alignment embeddings in its BERT-style architecture. By combining position and alignment embeddings on top of the text and speech embeddings, which are then concatenated, the model aligns text and audio more effectively. This approach is an enhancement over EditSpeech’s method of simply concatenating text and speaker embeddings with positional embeddings, as it enables the prediction of contextually coherent speech using masked reconstruction with the Conformer (Gulati et al., 2005) architecture (Peng et al., 2024; Alexos and Baldi, 2024).

A3T operates by using these embeddings in combination with a non-AR encoder to predict high-quality spectrograms, which are then refined using a five-layer CNN post-net. This refinement step helps generate more accurate and high-quality spectrograms, a step not present in the EditSpeech model. Additionally, it allows for faster inference and avoids some of the pitfalls of AR models, such as error accumulation.

The encoder and decoder are realized using the Conformer architecture, which integrates a CNN module and a feed-forward module. In experiments, A3T performed better than the traditional transformer in acoustic text processing, indicating an improvement over (Tan et al., 2021)’s LSTM-based forward and backward decoders.

Finally, the spectrogram is converted into an audio wave using a Parallel WaveGAN (Yamamoto et al., 2020) vocoder, different from (Tan et al., 2021)’s use of HiFi-GAN.

A3T is trained by masking random utterances and phones in the middle of sentences during training. Similar to the insertion and replacement process by (Tan et al., 2021), the embeddings are passed through eight Conformer layers. The output of these layers is combined with the post-net output to generate the final mel-spectrogram. The model is evaluated on its ability to reconstruct masked speech segments (repainting) conditioned on ground truth. The repainted speech is compared to human re-recordings to assess quality and naturalness.

A downside of this approach is that it assumes a deterministic mapping from text and context to the target, which is only realistic for very short

segments (Le et al., 2023).

### 3.6 VoiceBox

(Le et al., 2023) proposed VoiceBox, a generative model that uses non-AR flow matching to infill speech given audio context and text. It can perform several tasks such as noise removal (through infilling), content editing, and style conversion (Cámara et al., 2024; Peng et al., 2024; Le et al., 2023; Tae et al., 2021). Unlike models such as A3T from (Bai et al., 2022) and SpeechPainter (Borsos et al., 2022), which are only feasible for short segments and assume a deterministic mapping from text and context to the target, (Le et al., 2023)’s approach can infill data of any length and does not assume such a deterministic mapping. Additionally, VoiceBox can be trained on "in-the-wild" datasets with significant variation.

The infilling approach of VoiceBox involves generating speech segments based on surrounding audio context and corresponding text transcripts. Unlike previous models, VoiceBox does not rely on explicit audio style labels (e.g., speaker identity or emotion), making it more scalable and adaptable to diverse generative tasks. (Le et al., 2023)

VoiceBox is built on a non-AR continuous normalizing flow (CNF) architecture. It trains the CNF model to map a simple prior distribution to the target speech distribution and uses in-context learning by utilizing both preceding and succeeding context during generation, making it suitable for editing tasks where only a segment of speech needs to be generated. This contrasts with AR models, which generate speech sequentially from start to end.

Lastly, VoiceBox decouples audio and duration modeling, allowing for more precise control over alignment and the integration of continuous features. Although A3T and EditSpeech incorporate duration predictors, VoiceBox’s approach offers more flexibility in handling different generative tasks.

### 3.7 SpeechX

The model proposed in (Wang et al., 2023b) combines neural codec language modeling with a non-AR transformer to generate codec or acoustic tokens based on input, employing multi-task learning with task-dependent prompting (Cámara et al., 2024). Unlike (Bai et al., 2022), which is restricted to clean signals and lacks the ability to modify spoken content while preserving background sounds, this approach addresses these limitations for "noisy

speech editing". Additionally, unlike VoiceBox, which expects noisy signals to be surrounded by clean segments, this method does not have such constraints due to its design that allows task prompt tasks. This model preserves background noise during speech editing (Wang et al., 2023b). However, its performance is constrained by the accuracy of the neural codec model for acoustic tokenization (Wang et al., 2023b).

SpeechX integrates several advanced components to achieve its goals, distinguishing itself from previous models such as SpeechPainter, EditSpeech, A3T, and VoiceBox. SpeechX employs EnCodec (Défossez et al., 2022), a neural codec modeling architecture (encoder-decoder), producing a sequence of neural codecs that are converted to waveforms using a codec decoder. It receives a G2P, like A3T and EditSpeech, for text input for semantic tokens, and audio tokens are obtained by a neural codec model encoder. Both are embedded using sinusoidal style embedding projection.

The model uses both non-AR and AR transformer models. The AR model outputs neural codes, while the non-AR model generates neural codes for all layers, balancing generation flexibility and inference speed. During training, SpeechX was trained by swapping randomly between tasks like noise suppression and speech removal to prevent overfitting.

### 3.8 FluentSpeech

FluentSpeech (Jiang et al., 2023) is a context-aware, diffusion-based speech editing model designed for stutter removal without the over-smoothing seen in previous approaches (Peng et al., 2024). It iteratively refines modified mel-spectrograms with guidance from context features and a stutter predictor injected into its hidden sequence.

Building upon the works of Tan, Jin, Wang, and Bai (Tan et al., 2021; Jin et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2022; Bai et al., 2022), FluentSpeech aims to learn better contextual information from input mel-spectrograms. FluentSpeech outperforms these methods in terms of quality and prosody modeling. Previous methods only addressed reading-style speeches, leaving stutter removal a significant challenge (Jiang et al., 2023). Traditional stutter removal techniques often result in blurry mel-spectrograms lacking detail, creating unnatural sounds in the edited regions and requiring manual determination of the utter regions. FluentSpeech addresses these issues automatically using its stut-

ter predictor (Jiang et al., 2023), which localizes stutter regions and injects stutter embeddings into the text’s hidden sequence to reduce discrepancies between the text and the stuttering speech recording (Jiang et al., 2023).

However, it is important to note that FluentSpeech was only tested on English speech data, which may limit its generalizability to other languages and dialects (Jiang et al., 2023).

FluentSpeech’s architecture integrates a linguistic encoder, which is transformer-based, transforming the phoneme sequence of the transcription into a hidden text sequence. This approach aligns with the transformer architecture used in A3T but focuses specifically on stutter removal. A context-aware spectrogram denoiser in the form of a WaveNet (van den Oord et al., 2016) aggregates various features, including phoneme embeddings, acoustic embeddings, pitch embeddings, and stutter embeddings, similar to the context conditioning module in EditSpeech. This enhances the quality of the reconstructed mel-spectrograms, in conjunction with the stutter predictor.

Due to the modality gap between text and speech, FluentSpeech emphasizes alignment modeling (Jiang et al., 2023). It employs a masked duration predictor to achieve fluent duration transitions in edited regions.

### 3.9 VoiceCraft

VoiceCraft (Peng et al., 2024) introduces a regressive transformer decoder architecture for neural codec token infilling, similar to SpeechX, but with a distinct emphasis on AR prediction and bidirectional context. Their model refines AR sequence prediction and uses masked delayed stacking to enable generation within an existing sequence. VoiceCraft rearranges output tokens through causal masking with AR continuation or infilling within the bidirectional context and employs two delayed stacking mechanisms (multi-code block modeling).

The causal masking procedure moves the masked spans to the end of the sequence, allowing the model to use both past and future unmasked tokens during infilling. This bidirectional context is a significant advancement over the unidirectional approaches in models like EditSpeech. The delayed stacking mechanism ensures efficient multi-codebook modeling by delaying the integration of different codebook tokens until a later stage in the process.

The utilization of delayed stacking and causal

masking contrasts with the cross-modal alignment embeddings in A3T and the forward-backward decoding in EditSpeech. This allows VoiceCraft to achieve more accurate and contextually coherent infilling and continuation compared to the unidirectional approaches in A3T and EditSpeech.

The model employs a transformer decoder architecture, trained on AR sequence prediction. During training, spans of tokens are randomly masked, and the model predicts these masked tokens based on the unmasked tokens, similar to the masked reconstruction approach in A3T but with different masking and stacking techniques. VoiceCraft addresses limitations seen in VoiceBox, which expects noisy signals to be surrounded by clean segments. VoiceCraft’s flexible approach to sequence generation makes it more adaptable to various audio conditions without such constraints. However, it still faces some limitations, such as occasional long silences or scratching sounds. (Peng et al., 2024)

### 3.10 Attention Stitch

AttentionStitch (Alexos and Baldi, 2024) separates the TTS generation from the actual editing process, morphing the TTS-generated data into the edited portion. This is achieved by using a pre-trained TTS model and incorporating a double attention block network on top of it to automatically merge the synthesized mel-spectrogram with that of the edited text. According to their measurements, this approach enhances the naturalness of the stitched audio by creating a smoother audio segment.

Unlike SpeechPainter, EditSpeech, A3T, and FluentSpeech, which integrate the generation and editing processes, AttentionStitch separates TTS generation from the editing process. This separation allows for more precise control over the editing process and the use of pre-trained high-quality TTS models, leading to a unique model architecture.

The model uses a pre-trained FastSpeech2 (Ren et al., 2022) TTS model similar to (Bai et al., 2022), taking phonemes of the edited text as input to generate an initial mel-spectrogram. This contrasts with the models in EditSpeech, VoiceBox, and SpeechX, which do not explicitly utilize pre-trained TTS models for this purpose. This synthesized mel-spectrogram is then concatenated with a masked reference mel-spectrogram (with 10% of its content near the center masked). On top of this, a double attention block network is used to merge the synthesized mel-spectrogram with the edited text’s mel-spectrogram, ensuring a smooth transition between

the synthesized and reference segments.

This approach is distinct from the cross-modal alignment embeddings used in A3T, the forward-backward decoding in EditSpeech, and the diffusion-based approach in FluentSpeech. To refine the output, AttentionStitch uses a post-net module and a HiFi-GAN vocoder similar to the approach of (Morrison et al., 2021) to transform the mel-spectrogram into a waveform. Skip connections are employed between the output of the double attention block and the post-net, as they have proven beneficial in speech synthesis (Alexos and Baldi, 2024; Tu and Zhang, 2017; Shi et al., 2018).

During training, masking is performed by replacing corresponding parts of the mel-spectrogram with zeros, and the reference text is modified by replacing words with target words. To ensure the reference mel-spectrogram has the same length, they use the duration predictor of FastSpeech2 to resize the mask accordingly, similar to the approach used in A3T. The speech editing operation takes place within the double attention block, where a mean average error loss is used for both the double attention block and the post-net.

AttentionStitch deliberately avoids comparing with fully resynthesized edited text because the final audio sample, though indistinguishable in the edited part, differs from the reference audio. For the VCTK dataset, AttentionStitch is compared to competitive methods like A3T and EditSpeech. Models like SpeechPainter were excluded from the comparison due to their specific limitations and evaluation contexts, as SpeechPainter is limited to filling small gaps with the same text.

### 3.11 Mapache

AR modeling, which limits speech synthesis to left-to-right generation, is unsuitable for producing speech edits free from audio discontinuities (Cámbara et al., 2024). Mapache addresses this limitation by utilizing a non-AR architecture with parallel sequence-to-sequence transformers to model discrete text and speech representations, allowing for both speech editing and synthesis (Cámbara et al., 2024). Unlike SpeechX, EditSpeech, and Voicecraft that employ AR models, this approach enables more flexible and natural speech editing even if there are discontinuities in the audio, which cause difficulties to other AR models.

The architecture of Mapache consists of four main components. First, a speech tokenizer uses



a VQ-VAE (Vector Quantized Variational Autoencoder) (van den Oord et al., 2018) with an RNN prosody encoder post VQ codebook to convert the waveform into tokenized log-mel spectrograms. These spectrograms are then tokenized using the VQ encoder, with optimization based on mean squared error and commitment loss between the predicted and actual spectrogram.

The core component of Mapache is the parallel language modeling transformer, speechMPT, which takes the tokenized speech and text inputs to create embeddings and speech tokens. The transformer is composed of 30 blocks, each consisting of two 16-head attention layers followed by a feed-forward layer (using GeGLU (Shazeer, 2020)) with skip connections (Cámbara et al., 2024). The first attention layer performs self-attention over the masked and token embeddings, while the second layer performs cross-attention between text and speech embeddings, similar to the mechanisms used by (Borsos et al., 2022).

Next, a diffusion decoder (DiT-DDPM<sup>7</sup>) upscales the speech tokens or embeddings into log-mel spectrograms. This component uses denoising diffusion probabilistic models (DDPMs) and incorporates self-attention layers to refine the embeddings, enhancing speaker identity and speech articulation in the output. This is similar to the approaches used by (Jiang et al., 2023) and (Le et al., 2023), which also incorporate denoising and refinement techniques to enhance the quality of the generated speech.

Finally, a vocoder (UnivNet (Jang et al., 2021)) synthesizes the log-mel spectrograms into waveforms, completing the process.

## 4 Discussion

The comparison between the models is not straightforward due to several factors: some models are not openly accessible like (Wang et al., 2023b; Borsos et al., 2022), are trained on partially inaccessible files like (Cámbara et al., 2024), or are trained on a mixture of datasets that differ in quality and focus like (Cámbara et al., 2024; Jiang et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023b; Peng et al., 2024). Moreover, even if they were trained on the same dataset, their method of how they edited the data, preprocessed it as well as tested it on which task with which method differs so greatly, that it is almost impossible to compare

<sup>7</sup>based on DDPM <https://github.com/openai/improved-diffusion> and (Peebles and Xie, 2023)

two publications directly.

Additionally, the term "speech editing" is loosely defined, encompassing even smaller sub-parts of the process, and papers often use qualitative or different incomparable measures, making direct comparisons difficult. However, we attempt to address these issues in this section.

As stated previously, even though the datasets are different and have varying focuses, as discussed in Section 2.4 and highlighted in Figure 1, most models are tested on the VCTK (Veaux et al., 2017) and LJSpeech (Ito and Johnson, 2017) datasets. This commonality allows us to group them together and examine their results. We have grouped the objective measures in Table 3 and the subjective measures in Table 4, organized by their dataset and sorted by their measure.

As shown in Table 3, most models use the MOS to evaluate their performance. However, the MOS measurements themselves vary across research papers. Some studies measure the overall quality of speech (Le et al., 2023; Jiang et al., 2023), while others break it down into subcategories like naturalness, intelligibility, and speaker similarity (Peng et al., 2024; Jiang et al., 2023), or do not evaluate it distinctively against other baselines (Bai et al., 2022). Moreover, an intrinsic problem with MOS is that different raters might weigh its components differently, making it difficult to compare across papers as described in Section 2.1.

While it is feasible to compare different models within a single paper using the MOS measure, comparisons between papers are not possible due to its subjective nature. Therefore, we also created a table showing which papers have been compared using which measure, as seen in Table 5.

Another subjective measure used by (Cámbara et al., 2024) is the Multiple Stimuli with Hidden Reference and Anchor (MUSHRA). MUSHRA is a measure approved by the ITU<sup>8</sup> as a standard method for the subjective assessment of intermediate quality levels of audio systems. However, apart from (Cámbara et al., 2024), no other featured paper here used it to measure subjective performance. The scores for the subjective measures can be found in Table 3.

The research papers reviewed also include objective measures, as illustrated in Table 4. Most research teams used WER and similarity measures, which are common for TTS tasks. This is because

<sup>8</sup><https://www.itu.int/rec/R-REC-BS.1534-3-201510-I/en>

TTS is a significant component of speech editing, as newer papers often first generate text using TTS and then morph it into the context speaker’s voice (Morrison et al., 2021; Alexos and Baldi, 2024; Peng et al., 2024; Bai et al., 2022; Tan et al., 2021). Nevertheless, there are noticeable differences, such as the use of objective similarity measures "sim-o" and "sim-r," which differ from other similarity measures. Apart from WER and similarity measures, other measures such as Perceptual evaluation of speech quality (PESQ) (Rix et al., 2001), short-time objective intelligibility measure (STOI) (Taal et al., 2010), and MCD (Kubichek, 1993b) are used. PESQ and STOI indicate speech quality and intelligibility, respectively (Jiang et al., 2023), and were employed by EditSpeech (Tan et al., 2021) to compare models. However, the biggest challenge is that due to varying task descriptions—like inpainting of a word, phrase, or syllable, and noisy versus clean speech editing—papers are difficult to compare directly.

Paper	Language	Multi speaker	Unique Attribute
VOCO (Jin et al., 2017)	English	Yes	
AttentionStitch (Alexos and Baldi, 2024)	English	Yes	
VoiceCraft (Peng et al., 2024)	English	Yes	Realistic, Noisy data
Mapache (Cámara et al., 2024)	English	Yes	Amazon inhouse, Can not be evaluated
Voicebox (Le et al., 2023)	English <sup>1</sup>	Yes	Realistic, Noisy data
A3T (Bai et al., 2022)	English	Yes	
Speechpainter (Borsos et al., 2022)	English	Yes	
Editts (Tae et al., 2021)	English	No	
EditSpeech (Tan et al., 2021)	English <sup>2</sup>	Yes	
Fluentspeech (Jiang et al., 2023)	English	Yes	
SpeechX (Wang et al., 2023b)	English	Yes	Noisy data
RetrieverTTS (Yin et al., 2022)	English	Yes	
Morrison (Morrison et al., 2021)	English	No	

Table 2: Depiction of the languages the models were trained and tested with

1: it was additionally also evaluated on French, German, Spanish, Polish, and Portuguese; 2: Chinese

Some models, such as (Borsos et al., 2022), were not tested on any objective measures, or were incomparable due to different focuses and single-versus-multi-speaker scenarios, as highlighted in Table 2. While some research teams emphasized the use of many languages and tested their models accordingly, such as (Tan et al., 2021) with Chinese and (Le et al., 2023), which tested without multiple languages, others emphasized multi-speaker datasets with multiple English accents for robustness. Only the works of (Tae et al., 2021) and (Morrison et al., 2021) focused on single-speaker text editing using the LJSpeech (Ito and Johnson, 2017) dataset.

An interesting finding for zero-shot performance is that newer models place more emphasis on the use of realistic, in-the-wild data to enhance their models with data that has worse acoustic quality,

noise, or stuttering (Peng et al., 2024; Cámara et al., 2024; Le et al., 2023). In some cases, data was deliberately mixed with noisy samples to degrade the quality of the training and test datasets (Wang et al., 2023b).

## 5 Conclusion

Speech editing is an established discipline that has recently been significantly advanced by the rise of Transformers (Vaswani et al., 2017) and their corresponding attention layers. This technological leap has brought new capabilities and precision to the field. Moreover, the growing interest from major tech companies in speech editing is likely to accelerate the development of advanced speech editing systems.

Transformers, such as ChatGPT and other models, have already integrated into everyday life, and the next major development is likely to be enhanced TTS systems, which play a crucial role in speech editing. Our contribution with this paper aims to leverage current knowledge and inspire more researchers and students to delve into the topic of speech editing. By providing a comprehensive comparison of the latest methods, their similarities, challenges, and drawbacks, we hope to offer valuable insights and foster increased interest and innovation in this field.

## References

- Antonios Alexos and Pierre Baldi. 2024. *Attention-stitch: How attention solves the speech editing problem*.
- He Bai, Renjie Zheng, Junkun Chen, Mingbo Ma, Xintong Li, and Liang Huang. 2022. *A<sup>3</sup>T: Alignment-aware acoustic and text pretraining for speech synthesis and editing*. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1399–1411. PMLR.
- Zalán Borsos, Matt Sharifi, and Marco Tagliasacchi. 2022. *Speechpainter: Text-conditioned speech inpainting*.
- Guoguo Chen, Shuzhou Chai, Guanbo Wang, Jiayu Du, Wei-Qiang Zhang, Chao Weng, Dan Su, Daniel Povey, Jan Trmal, Junbo Zhang, Mingjie Jin, Sanjeev Khudanpur, Shinji Watanabe, Shuaijiang Zhao, Wei Zou, Xiangang Li, Xuchen Yao, Yongqing Wang, Yujun Wang, Zhao You, and Zhiyong Yan. 2021. *Gigaspeech: An evolving, multi-domain asr corpus with 10,000 hours of transcribed audio*.

- Sanyuan Chen, Chengyi Wang, Zhengyang Chen, Yu Wu, Shujie Liu, Zhuo Chen, Jinyu Li, Naoyuki Kanda, Takuya Yoshioka, Xiong Xiao, et al. 2022. Wavlm: Large-scale self-supervised pre-training for full stack speech processing. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, 16(6):1505–1518.
- Ann Clifton, Sravana Reddy, Yongze Yu, Aasish Pappu, Rezvaneh Rezapour, Hamed Bonab, Maria Eskevich, Gareth Jones, Jussi Karlgren, Ben Carterette, and Rosie Jones. 2020. [100,000 podcasts: A spoken English document corpus](#). In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 5903–5917, Barcelona, Spain (Online). International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- Guillermo Cámara, Patrick Lumban Tobing, Mikolaj Babianski, Ravichander Vippera, Duo Wang Ron Shmelkin, Giuseppe Coccia, Orazio Angelini, Arnaud Joly, Mateusz Lajszczak, and Vincent Pollet. 2024. [Mapache: Masked parallel transformer for advanced speech editing and synthesis](#). In *ICASSP 2024 - 2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 10691–10695.
- S. Davis and P. Mermelstein. 1980. [Comparison of parametric representations for monosyllabic word recognition in continuously spoken sentences](#). *IEEE Transactions on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, 28(4):357–366.
- Alexandre Défossez, Jade Copet, Gabriel Synnaeve, and Yossi Adi. 2022. [High fidelity neural audio compression](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2210.13438.
- Anmol Gulati, James Qin, Chung-Cheng Chiu, Niki Parmar, Yu Zhang, Jiahui Yu, Wei Han, Shibo Wang, Zhengdong Zhang, Yonghui Wu, and Ruoming Pang. 2005. [Conformer: Convolution-augmented transformer for speech recognition](#).
- Anmol Gulati, James Qin, Chung-Cheng Chiu, Niki Parmar, Yu Zhang, Jiahui Yu, Wei Han, Shibo Wang, Zhengdong Zhang, Yonghui Wu, and Ruoming Pang. 2020. [Conformer: Convolution-augmented transformer for speech recognition](#).
- Wei-Ning Hsu, Benjamin Bolte, Yao-Hung Hubert Tsai, Kushal Lakhotia, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Abdelrahman Mohamed. 2021. Hubert: Self-supervised speech representation learning by masked prediction of hidden units. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 29:3451–3460.
- Keith Ito and Linda Johnson. 2017. The lj speech dataset.
- Andrew Jaegle, Sebastian Borgeaud, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Carl Doersch, Catalin Ionescu, David Ding, Skanda Koppula, Daniel Zoran, Andrew Brock, Evan Shelhamer, Olivier Hénaff, Matthew M. Botvinick, Andrew Zisserman, Oriol Vinyals, and João Carreira. 2022. [Perceiver io: A general architecture for structured inputs & outputs](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2107.14795.
- Won Jang, Dan Lim, Jaesam Yoon, Bongwan Kim, and Juntae Kim. 2021. [Univnet: A neural vocoder with multi-resolution spectrogram discriminators for high-fidelity waveform generation](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2106.07889.
- Ziyue Jiang, Qian Yang, Jialong Zuo, Zhenhui Ye, Rongjie Huang, Yi Ren, and Zhou Zhao. 2023. [Fluentspeech: Stutter-oriented automatic speech editing with context-aware diffusion models](#).
- Zeyu Jin, Gautham J. Mysore, Stephen Diverdi, Jingwan Lu, and Adam Finkelstein. 2017. [Voco: text-based insertion and replacement in audio narration](#). *ACM Transactions on Graphics*, 36(4):1–13.
- Eugene Kharitonov, Ann Lee, Adam Polyak, Yossi Adi, Jade Copet, Kushal Lakhotia, Tu-Anh Nguyen, Morgane Rivière, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Emmanuel Dupoux, et al. 2021. [Text-free prosody-aware generative spoken language modeling](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.03264*.
- Jungil Kong, Jaehyeon Kim, and Jaekyoung Bae. 2020. [Hifi-gan: Generative adversarial networks for efficient and high fidelity speech synthesis](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2010.05646.
- R. Kubichek. 1993a. [Mel-cepstral distance measure for objective speech quality assessment](#). In *Proceedings of IEEE Pacific Rim Conference on Communications Computers and Signal Processing*, volume 1, pages 125–128 vol.1.
- Robert Kubichek. 1993b. [Mel-cepstral distance measure for objective speech quality assessment](#). In *Proceedings of IEEE pacific rim conference on communications computers and signal processing*, volume 1, pages 125–128. IEEE.
- Kundan Kumar, Rithesh Kumar, Thibault de Boissiere, Lucas Gestein, Wei Zhen Teoh, Jose Sotelo, Alexandre de Brebisson, Yoshua Bengio, and Aaron Courville. 2019. [Melgan: Generative adversarial networks for conditional waveform synthesis](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1910.06711.
- Matthew Le, Apoorv Vyas, Bowen Shi, Brian Karrer, Leda Sari, Rashel Moritz, Mary Williamson, Vimal Manohar, Yossi Adi, Jay Mahadeokar, and Wei-Ning Hsu. 2023. [Voicebox: Text-guided multilingual universal speech generation at scale](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 14005–14034. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Chen-Chou Lo, Szu-Wei Fu, Wen-Chin Huang, Xin Wang, Junichi Yamagishi, Yu Tsao, and Hsin-Min Wang. 2019. [Mosnet: Deep learning based objective assessment for voice conversion](#).
- Max Morrison, Lucas Rencker, Zeyu Jin, Nicholas J. Bryan, Juan-Pablo Caceres, and Bryan Pardo. 2021. [Context-aware prosody correction for text-based speech editing](#). In *ICASSP 2021 - 2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 7038–7042.

- Éric Moulines and Francis Charpentier. 1989. [Pitch-synchronous waveform processing techniques for text-to-speech synthesis using diphones](#). *Speech Commun.*, 9:453–467.
- William Peebles and Saining Xie. 2023. [Scalable diffusion models with transformers](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2212.09748.
- Puyuan Peng, Po-Yao Huang, Abdelrahman Mohamed, and David Harwath. 2024. [Voicecraft: Zero-shot speech editing and text-to-speech in the wild](#).
- Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Tao Xu, Greg Brockman, Christine McLeavey, and Ilya Sutskever. 2022. [Robust speech recognition via large-scale weak supervision](#).
- Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Tao Xu, Greg Brockman, Christine McLeavey, and Ilya Sutskever. 2023. [Robust speech recognition via large-scale weak supervision](#). In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 28492–28518. PMLR.
- Chandan KA Reddy, Vishak Gopal, and Ross Cutler. 2021. [Dnsmos: A non-intrusive perceptual objective speech quality metric to evaluate noise suppressors](#). In *ICASSP 2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 6493–6497. IEEE.
- Chandan KA Reddy, Vishak Gopal, and Ross Cutler. 2022. [Dnsmos p.835: A non-intrusive perceptual objective speech quality metric to evaluate noise suppressors](#). In *ICASSP 2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE.
- Yi Ren, Chenxu Hu, Xu Tan, Tao Qin, Sheng Zhao, Zhou Zhao, and Tie-Yan Liu. 2022. [Fastspeech 2: Fast and high-quality end-to-end text to speech](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2006.04558.
- Antony W Rix, John G Beerends, Michael P Hollier, and Andries P Hekstra. 2001. [Perceptual evaluation of speech quality \(pesq\)-a new method for speech quality assessment of telephone networks and codecs](#). In *2001 IEEE international conference on acoustics, speech, and signal processing. Proceedings (Cat. No. 01CH37221)*, volume 2, pages 749–752. IEEE.
- Noam Shazeer. 2020. [Glu variants improve transformer](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2002.05202.
- Jonathan Shen, Ruoming Pang, Ron J. Weiss, Mike Schuster, Navdeep Jaitly, Zongheng Yang, Zhifeng Chen, Yu Zhang, Yuxuan Wang, RJ Skerry-Ryan, Rif A. Saurous, Yannis Agiomyrigiannakis, and Yonghui Wu. 2018. [Natural tts synthesis by conditioning wavenet on mel spectrogram predictions](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1712.05884.
- Yupeng Shi, Weicong Rong, and Nengheng Zheng. 2018. [Speech enhancement using convolutional neural network with skip connections](#). In *2018 11th International Symposium on Chinese Spoken Language Processing (ISCSLP)*, pages 6–10.
- Cees H Taal, Richard C Hendriks, Richard Heusdens, and Jesper Jensen. 2010. [A short-time objective intelligibility measure for time-frequency weighted noisy speech](#). In *2010 IEEE international conference on acoustics, speech and signal processing*, pages 4214–4217. IEEE.
- Jaesung Tae, Hyeongju Kim, and Taesu Kim. 2021. [Editts: Score-based editing for controllable text-to-speech](#).
- Daxin Tan, Liqun Deng, Yu Ting Yeung, Xin Jiang, Xiao Chen, and Tan Lee. 2021. [Editspeech: A text based speech editing system using partial inference and bidirectional fusion](#). In *2021 IEEE Automatic Speech Recognition and Understanding Workshop (ASRU)*, pages 626–633.
- Ming Tu and Xianxian Zhang. 2017. [Speech enhancement based on deep neural networks with skip connections](#). In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 5565–5569.
- Amazon Mechanical Turk. 2012. [Amazon mechanical turk](#). *Retrieved August, 17:2012*.
- Aaron van den Oord, Sander Dieleman, Heiga Zen, Karen Simonyan, Oriol Vinyals, Alex Graves, Nal Kalchbrenner, Andrew Senior, and Koray Kavukcuoglu. 2016. [Wavenet: A generative model for raw audio](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1609.03499.
- Aaron van den Oord, Oriol Vinyals, and Koray Kavukcuoglu. 2018. [Neural discrete representation learning](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1711.00937.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. [Attention is all you need](#). *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Christophe Veaux, Junichi Yamagishi, Kirsten MacDonald, et al. 2017. [Cstr vctk corpus: English multi-speaker corpus for cstr voice cloning toolkit](#). *University of Edinburgh. The Centre for Speech Technology Research (CSTR)*, 6:15.
- Mahesh Viswanathan and Madhubalan Viswanathan. 2005. [Measuring speech quality for text-to-speech systems: development and assessment of a modified mean opinion score \(mos\) scale](#). *Computer Speech & Language*, 19(1):55–83.
- Chengyi Wang, Sanyuan Chen, Yu Wu, Ziqiang Zhang, Long Zhou, Shujie Liu, Zhuo Chen, Yanqing Liu, Huaming Wang, Jinyu Li, et al. 2023a. [Neural codec language models are zero-shot text to speech synthesizers](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.02111*.
- Tao Wang, Jiangyan Yi, Liqun Deng, Ruibo Fu, Jianhua Tao, and Zhengqi Wen. 2022. [Context-aware mask prediction network for end-to-end text-based speech editing](#). In *ICASSP 2022 - 2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 6082–6086.

Xiaofei Wang, Manthan Thakker, Zhuo Chen, Naoyuki Kanda, Sefik Emre Eskimez, Sanyuan Chen, Min Tang, Shujie Liu, Jinyu Li, and Takuya Yoshioka. 2023b. [Speechx: Neural codec language model as a versatile speech transformer.](#)

Ryuichi Yamamoto, Eunwoo Song, and Jae-Min Kim. 2020. [Parallel wavegan: A fast waveform generation model based on generative adversarial networks with multi-resolution spectrogram.](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:1910.11480.

Dacheng Yin, Chuanxin Tang, Yanqing Liu, Xiaoqiang Wang, Zhiyuan Zhao, Yucheng Zhao, Zhiwei Xiong, Sheng Zhao, and Chong Luo. 2022. [Retrievertts: Modeling decomposed factors for text-based speech insertion.](#) In *Interspeech*. arXiv.

Steve J. Young, Gunnar Evermann, Mark John Francis Gales, Thomas Hain, Dan J. Kershaw, Gareth L. Moore, J. J. Odell, David Ollason, Daniel Povey, Valtchev, and Philip C. Woodland. 2006. [The htk book version 3.4.](#)

Heiga Zen, Viet Dang, Rob Clark, Yu Zhang, Ron J Weiss, Ye Jia, Zhifeng Chen, and Yonghui Wu. 2019. [Libritts: A corpus derived from librispeech for text-to-speech.](#) *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.02882*.

## A Appendix

Task	Measure	Mapache	A3T	AttentionStich	Edit speech	FluentSpeech	VoiceCraft	SpeechX (Vall-E)	VoiceBox	SpeechPainter
<b>Testset: Custom VoiceBox</b>										
Noise Removal	SIM ↑	0.148								0.612
Zero shot TTS cross sentence	SIM ↑	0.046								0.662
Zero shot TTS cross sentence	SIM ↑	0.146								0.681
Noise Removal	WER ↓	11.5								2
Zero shot TTS cross sentence	WER ↓	63.3								1.9
<b>Testset: LibriTts</b>										
Clean Speech editing	SIM ↑	0.29								0.76
Noisy Speech editing	SIM ↑	0.18								0.65
Clean Speech editin	WER ↓	17.7								5.63
Noisy Speech editing	WER ↓	32.17								13.95
<b>Testset: LibriTTS</b>										
Speech Editing	MCD ↓	6.25		6.92	5.86					
Speech Editing	PRESQ ↑	1.18		1.43	1.91					
Zero shot tts	SIM ↑	0.41		0.47	0.47	0.55				
Speech Editing	STOI ↑	0.41		0.69	0.81					
Zero shot tts	WER ↓			3.5	4.5					
<b>Testset: Mapache Speechset</b>										
Inpainting (phrase)	SIM ↑	0.93	0.74							
Inpainting (syllable)	SIM ↑	0.95	0.9							
Inpainting (word)	SIM ↑	0.94	0.85							
Inpainting (phrase)	WER ↓	4	21							
Inpainting (syllable)	WER ↓	5.5	9.8							
Inpainting (word)	WER ↓	4.1	12.3							
<b>Testset: RealEdu</b>										
Speech Editing	WER ↓			4.3	6.1					
<b>Testset: VCTK</b>										
Speech Editing	MCD ↓	5.69		5.33	4.74					
Tts edit	MCD ↓	7.97	6.5	7.54						
Speech Editing	PRESQ ↑	1.39		1.35	1.82					
Speech Editing	STOI ↑	0.7		0.68	0.78					

Table 3: Comparison of the **objective** measures and results from the presented papers for their respective tasks on various test sets and metrics.

The ↑, ↓ arrows mark, that higher and lower values are preferred respectively.

Task	Measure	Mapache	A3T	AttentionStich	Edit speech	FluentSpeech	VoiceCraft	SpeechX (Vall-E)	VoiceBox	SpeechPainter
<b>Testset: Custom VoiceBox</b>										
Noise Removal	MOS ↑(Speech Quality)		3.10(±0.1)							3.87(±0.17)
<b>Testset: LibriTTS</b>										
Speech Editing	MOS ↑(Intelligibility)						3.80(±0.09)	4.05(±0.08)		
Speech Editing	MOS ↑(Naturalness)						3.81(±0.06)	4.03(±0.05)		
Zero shot tts	MOS ↑(Intelligibility)						3.74(±0.1)	4.38(±0.08)		
Zero shot tts	MOS ↑(Naturalness)						3.54(±0.1)	4.16(±0.08)		
Zero shot tts	MOS ↑(Speaker Similarity)						4.10(±0.09)	4.35(±0.08)		
<b>Testset: LibriTTS Custom</b>										
Inpainting (v1)	MOS ↑(Naturalness)									3.60 ± 0.09
<b>Testset: LibriTTS Editin</b>										
Inpainting (v1)	MOS ↑(Naturalness)									3.12 ± 0.10
<b>Testset: Mapache Speechset</b>										
Inpainting (phrase)	MUSICA ↑	76.1	82.3							
Inpainting (syllable)	MUSICA ↑	76.3	82.1							
Inpainting (word)	MUSICA ↑	77.3	83.8							
<b>Testset: RealEdu</b>										
Speech Editing	MOS ↑(Intelligibility)						3.97(±0.05)	4.11(±0.05)		
Speech Editing	MOS ↑(Naturalness)						3.81(±0.06)	4.03(±0.05)		
<b>Testset: VCTK</b>										
Speech editing (mean)	MOS ↑	3.51(±0.1)							3.92(±0.16)	
Speech editing (phrase)	MOS ↑	3.65(±0.15)							3.58(±0.16)	
Tts edit	MOS ↑	3.1(±0.3)	3.51(±0.23)						3.28(±0.3)	
<b>Testset: LibriTTS</b>										
Speech Editing	MOS ↑(Speaker Similarity) Seen						4.27(±0.09)	4.26(±0.10)	4.42(±0.06)	3.70 ± 0.09
Speech Editing	MOS ↑(Speaker Similarity) Unseen						3.51(±0.14)	3.90(±0.1)	4.11(±0.1)	
Speech Editing (clean speaker)	MOS ↑(Speech Quality)						4.09(±0.10)	4.09(±0.1)	4.27(±0.1)	
Speech Editing (noisy speaker)	MOS ↑(Speech Quality)						3.90(±0.10)	3.89(±0.09)	4.18(±0.09)	

Table 4: Comparison of the **subjective** measures and results from the presented papers for their respective tasks on various test sets and metrics.

The ↑, ↓ arrows mark, that higher and lower values are preferred respectively.

Task	EditSpeech 2021	A3T	VoiceBox	FluentSpeech	Edits	SpeechPainter
<b>EditSpeech 2021</b>						
Baker: Identity speech reconstruction						
EditSpeech 2021						
A3T						
Baker: Identity speech reconstruction						
EditSpeech 2021						
VoiceBox						
Baker: Identity speech reconstruction						
EditSpeech 2021						
SpeechPainter						
Baker: Identity speech reconstruction						
EditSpeech 2021						
SpeechX						
Baker: Identity speech reconstruction						
EditSpeech 2021						
FluentSpeech						
Baker: Identity speech reconstruction						
EditSpeech 2021						
VoiceCraft						
Baker: Identity speech reconstruction						
EditSpeech 2021						
AttentionStich						
Baker: Identity speech reconstruction						
EditSpeech 2021						
Mapache						
Baker: Identity speech reconstruction						
EditSpeech 2021						

Table 5: The paper on the Y axis (sorted from the oldest to newest) were compared with the paper on the X axis

\*: based on the nature of the works, (Alexos and Baldi, 2024) didn't want to be compared with them

Paper	Model Type
VOCO (Jin et al., 2017)	non-AR
Morrison (Morrison et al., 2021)	non-AR
SpeechPainter (Borsos et al., 2022)	non-AR
Editspeech (Tan et al., 2021)	AR
A3T (Bai et al., 2022)	AR
Voicebox (Le et al., 2023)	non-AR
SpeechX (Wang et al., 2023b)	non-AR
Fluentspeech (Jiang et al., 2023)	non-AR
VoiceCraft (Peng et al., 2024)	AR
AttentionStich (Alexos and Baldi, 2024)	non-AR
Mapache (Cámara et al., 2024)	non-AR

Table 6: Depiction of the languages the models were trained and tested with

1: it was additionally also evaluated on French, German, Spanish, Polish, and Portuguese; 2: Chinese