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1. **Introduction**

Today, thanks to accumulated empirical knowledge, traditional recognition methods, including those based on spectral analysis, have become quite effective tools for recognizing sound signals, in particular, words pronounced by a native speaker with his or her own pronunciation in various tonalities (Geler et al.; Itakura, 1975; Linh et al., 2014; Zhi-Qiang et al., 2024; Jiang and Chen; Novozhilov, 2016; Rajeev and Abhishek, 2019; Afouras et al., 2018; Haridas et al., 2018; Elmir and Abdeslam, 2019). In this regard, the study of various factors and characteristics of a speech sound recording is of particular interest. At the same time, the possibility of directly processing a sound recording in the form of a one-dimensional representation of sound wave oscillations with a certain sampling frequency makes it possible to recognize sound signals taking into account the features of pronunciation and tonality using traditional recognition methods. The following methods are used as tools for voice signal recognition (Dynamic Time Warping, DTW) and (Derivative Dynamic Time Warping, DDTW) which have proven themselves in the contextual field, as well as recognition methods based on the Fourier transform and wavelet transform, which is used in continuous and discrete cases. Obviously, the most important condition for the efficiency of a computational experiment related to voice signal identification is the accuracy of the recognition method used.

1. **Related works**

Speech recognition has been a widely studied field with numerous methodologies proposed for improving accuracy and efficiency. Several studies have explored the use of spectral analysis techniques such as Fourier Transform, Wavelet Transform, and Dynamic Time Warping (DTW) for speech processing. This section highlights some of the key works referenced in this paper that have significantly contributed to the development of speech recognition technologies. Today, there are two main areas of development in speech recognition: Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR) and Natural Language Processing (NLP). It should be noted that each of these methods has unique features, advantages, and disadvantages.

The ASR is a combination of computer hardware and software technologies that directly identify and process the human voice (Yu and Li, 2016). The operating principle of this technology can be defined as automatic transcription of spoken language into readable text. Voice recognition occurs in real time based on pre-set sound patterns. Thus, the ASR method provides the computer with the ability to identify words from human speech and translate them into electronic text.

NLP is an innovative method of voice recognition. It is a current direction in the field of machine learning, in which voice processing is performed based on intelligent algorithms (Khurana et al., 2023). In this case, one of the options for the voice recognition process in a voice assistant based on NLP may look like this: recording a person's speech; machine conversion of words from audio into electronic text; parsing the text into its main components to understand the context of the conversation and the person's goals; based on the results of the work, the system determines the command to execute.

1. **Material and Methods**

Speech recognition technology has seen remarkable advancements in recent years, yet significant challenges remain in the accurate recognition of underrepresented languages such as Azerbaijani. The complexity of speech signals, variations in pronunciation, and tonal differences necessitate robust methodologies for effective recognition. Developing accurate recognition methods for Azerbaijani is crucial for integrating AI-powered solutions into various applications, including education, customer service, and assistive technologies. Furthermore, speech-based systems that cater to diverse linguistic structures enhance inclusivity and accessibility for users worldwide. The present study addresses these challenges by evaluating and comparing multiple recognition methods to determine the most effective approach for processing Azerbaijani speech signals.

**3.1. Problem Definition**

Several words, such as “book”, “notebook” and “pencil” are reproduced by a person in Azerbaijani as [k'ıt'a: b], [dæf'tər] and [gjæ'læm], and are converted into analog signals through an appropriate audio device. Further, by quantization, these signals are transformed into corresponding digital signals *s*1, *s*2 and *s*3, which form the current audio database shown in Fig. 1.



**Fig. 1.** Audio database including digital signals *s*1, *s*2, *s*3

Assume that the word “pencil” is reproduced by a native speaker with his characteristic pronunciation three times in succession in different tonalities. After the appropriate transformations, this sound recording is represented as three corresponding digital signals (see fig. 2), which are reflected in expanded form in fig. 3.



**Fig. 2.** Sound recording of the Azerbaijani word “pencil” pronounced three times in succession



**Fig. 3.** The Azerbaijani word “pencil”, pronounced in three different tonalities: *p*1, *p*2 and *p*3

Based on this trivial example, it is necessary to formulate an approach to recognizing sound signals voiced by a native speaker. Based on the selected recognition mechanism, it is necessary to formulate and experimentally test an approach to forming an audio database that adequately reflects words from the Azerbaijani lexicon.

* 1. **Problem Solution**

To address the challenges associated with recognizing Azerbaijani speech signals, a combination of traditional and modern recognition techniques is applied. This study utilizes Dynamic Time Warping (DTW) and Derivative Dynamic Time Warping (DDTW) to account for variations in pronunciation. Additionally, spectral analysis methods such as Fourier Transform (FT), Discrete Wavelet Transform (DWT), and Continuous Wavelet Transform (CWT) are employed to enhance accuracy. By comparing the effectiveness of these methods, the study aims to identify the optimal approach for speech signal recognition. The integration of these techniques allows for improved handling of tonal shifts and pronunciation inconsistencies, ultimately leading to a more robust speech recognition system for Azerbaijani language applications.

* 1. **Methods of Recognition and Criteria of Their Adequacy**

Within the framework of the proposed approach, the mechanism for recognizing voice signals involves the use of DTW and DDTW methods, as well as recognition methods based on spectral analysis of signals, in particular, on the Fourier transform and wavelet transform, which is used for continuous and discrete cases.

**DTW Method.** This method has been studied quite well (Sakoe, 1978) and has been used in signal processing practice for a long time. Using a trivial example, the essence of the DTW method is as follows. Let {*f*1, *f*2, …, *fn*} and {*g*1, *g*2, …, *gm*} with lengths *n* and *m*, respectively, be numerical sequences. At the initial stage, local deviations between the components of these sequences are calculated in absolute value using, for example, the Euclidean metric. As a result, a matrix of size *n*×*m* is formed, consisting of square deviations of the form *dij* = (*fi*–*gj*)2, *i* = 1÷*n*, *j* = 1÷*m*, and the minimum distance DTW(*fi*, *gj*) is calculated using the following equalities:



As a result of the iterative calculation of the DTW(*fi*, *gj*) indicator, the norm of the distance between signals is set in the following form

. (1)

The application of the DTW method implies the fulfillment of the following conditions:

* Monotonicity – both indices *i* and *j* increase consistently.
* Continuity– in one step the indices *i* and *j* increase by no more than one.
* The sequential construction of the “paths” starts in the lower left and ends in the upper right corner.

The DTW algorithm is applied with “limitation” and “without limitation” on the size of the so-called “window”, the size of which *w* determines the number of samples, allowing comparison of signal components both on the right and on the left. In this case, the total number of samples is 2*w*+1, where the procedure for comparing *fi* and *gj* by the *i*-th sample point of the 1st and the *j*-th sample point of the 2nd must correspond to the inequality |*i*–*j*| ≤ *w*.

**DDTW Method** (Keogh and Pazzani, 2024). Unlike DTW, which uses amplitude values at the sample points, the DDTW method uses their first derivatives. As is known, for the discrete case, the 1st-order derivative at the sample point is determined as: , where *a*(*i*) = *a*(*iT*), *i* = 0, 1, …, *N*; *T* is the sampling period of the analog signal *a*. Therefore, replacing *fi* and *gj* in the representation of the minimum distance in the DTW method with the corresponding derivatives *pi* and *qj* (*i*=1÷*n*, *j*=1÷*m*), for the DDTW method we have, respectively:



In this case, the norm of the distance between signals is formed similarly in the form

. (2)

**Fourier transform** **(FT)** (Hindarto). The Fourier transform is the main mathematical basis of spectral analysis as the main method of signal processing. FT connects a spatial or temporal signal (or some model of this signal) with its representation in the frequency domain. That is, the Fourier transform of a real-valued function defined on the time axis of the variable *t*, as an integral representation, provides information only about the frequency that is present in the signal and does not provide any information about the time interval in which this frequency is present in the signal. By its nature, the conventional Fourier transform cannot distinguish a stationary signal from a non-stationary one, which is a major problem for its applicability. Therefore, further in the article, it is applied the windowed Fourier transform of the form

,

where *W*(*τ*-*t*) is the so-called window function, which can be a Gaussian, Hamming window, Hann window or Kaiser window. Unlike the usual Fourier transform, the windowed Fourier transform is already a function of time, frequency and amplitude. That is, it allows to obtain the characteristic of the distribution of the signal frequency (with amplitude) over time.

Thus, the usual Fourier transform is considered to be a windowed Fourier transform with a window of infinite width. As the window width increases (its resolution decreases), the accuracy relative to frequency increases, but the accuracy relative to time decreases. The question arises: how to select the window width value to achieve the optimal ratio of accuracies? The wavelet transform answers this question.

**Wavelet transform** (WT) (Zhao et al., 2009; Saraswat et al., 2024). The method based on the wavelet transform was created as a tool that solves the Heisenberg uncertainty problem for constructing the time-frequency characteristics of a signal. Unlike the windowed Fourier transform, which has a constant scale at any time for all frequencies, the wavelet transform has a better time representation and a worse frequency representation at low signal frequencies and a better frequency representation with a worse time representation at high signal frequencies.

In the discrete case, wavelets are represented by samples. The continuous wavelet transform maps a real-valued function defined on the time axis of the variable *t* into the following function of two variables

,

where *τ* denotes parallel shift, and *s* represents the scale.

Further, in the process of processing sound signals voiced by a native speaker, discrete (DWT) and continuous (CWT) wavelet transforms are used. It should be noted that FT, DWT and CWT, being methods of spectral analysis, allow determining the powers of the detected spectra.

In (Kerimov, 2022; Rzayev and Kerimov, 2023), 4 criteria for assessing the adequacy of one-dimensional signal recognition methods for their accuracy were proposed and experimentally substantiated. In this case, *S* artificial families of signals were used as test examples, formed by uniformly shifting to the right or diagonally relative to the selected base signal (Rzayev and Kerimov, 2024).

For the sake of integrity of further discussions, the first three of these criteria are given below in a somewhat abbreviated form, taking into account the following concepts and notations: *MV* is the mean value; *SD* is the standard deviation;  is the distance between two signals *si* and *sj* (*i*, *j* = 1÷*Ns*), where *k* = 1, 2, … is the serial number of the recognition method; *Ns* is the number of signals in *S*; *h* is signal shift step when forming *S*.

*Criterion* *C*1 (*uniformity*): as the recogniseble signals become more distant, their distances from the base signal (etalon) should increase uniformly, rather than varying abruptly. Formally, this criterion is described as follows:

, (3)

where

(*j* = 1÷*Ns*). (4)

, as the maximum deviation of the derivatives of the distances, quantitatively reflects the adequacy of the *k*-th method according to the criterion *C*1.

*Criterion* *C*2 (*symmetry*): for a specific recognizable signal, the Euclidean distances from the left-hand and right-hand signals must be approximately equal, i.e. their ratio must be approximately equal to one. If the left-hand and right-hand signals are symmetrical relative to the given signal, then, obviously, these distances will be absolutely equal, i.e. their pairwise ratios will be identical to one. Formally, this criterion is described by the following ratio:

 (*i* = 1÷*Ns*), (5)

which determines the proportion between adjacent distances, in particular, between the distances from the right-hand located (*i*+1)-th and the left-hand located (*i*-1)-th signals to the *i*-th signal. In this case, for *i* = 1÷*Ns* we similarly have:

. (6)

*Criterion* *C*3 (*operating speed*): as the recognizable signals “approach” the etalon, the speed of convergence of distance values increases. Here, the speed of convergence of distance values is understood as the ratio of the next to the current distance, when considering the sequence of distances in reverse order. Formally, this criterion is described by the following relationship:

 (*i* = *Ns*÷1). (7)

In this case, the value

 (8)

determines the speed of convergence of distances .

* 1. **Signal Recognition**

The classical procedure of signal recognition is implemented by comparing the recognizable signals with the etalon by calculating the pairwise distances between them based on the selected metric. Comparisons of the recognizable signals *p*1, *p*2 and *p*3 with the signals from the formed audio database are carried out for different window sizes *w*. Thus, for the case *w* = 5, the results of the pairwise comparison of signals from the family *S* = {*s*1, *s*2, *s*3*, p*1, *p*2, *p*3} using the DTW, DDTW, FT, DWT and CWT methods are summarized in tables 1-5.

**Table 1.** Results of pairwise comparison of signals from the *S* family using DTW

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Signal | *s*1 | *s*2 | *s*3 | *p*1 | *p*2 | *p*3 |
| *s*1 | 0 | 7.5780 | 15.0797 | 11.4542 | 12.4801 | 7.9502 |
| *s*2 | 7.5780 | 0 | 11.3362 | 10.2564 | 10.1183 | 9.4793 |
| *s*3 | 15.0797 | 11.3362 | 0 | 9.5579 | 7.8630 | 14.5444 |
| *p*1 | 11.4542 | 10.2564 | 9.5579 | 0 | 11.8500 | 13.0588 |
| *p*2 | 12.4801 | 10.1183 | 7.8630 | 11.8500 | 0 | 9.5309 |
| *p*3 | 7.9502 | 9.4793 | 14.5444 | 13.0588 | 9.5309 | 0 |

**Table 2.** Results of pairwise comparison of signals from the *S* family using DDTW

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Signal | *s*1 | *s*2 | *s*3 | *p*1 | *p*2 | *p*3 |
| *s*1 | 0 | 3.6679 | 6.6530 | 4.2606 | 5.3159 | 4.0468 |
| *s*2 | 3.6679 | 0 | 5.4151 | 4.2208 | 4.7423 | 4.3953 |
| *s*3 | 6.6530 | 5.4151 | 0 | 5.0817 | 4.3954 | 5.6842 |
| *p*1 | 4.2606 | 4.2208 | 5.0817 | 0 | 5.7146 | 5.1279 |
| *p*2 | 5.3159 | 4.7423 | 4.3954 | 5.7146 | 0 | 3.7159 |
| *p*3 | 4.0468 | 4.3953 | 5.6842 | 5.1279 | 3.7159 | 0 |

**Table 3.** Results of pairwise comparison of signals from the *S* family using FT

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Signal | *s*1 | *s*2 | *s*3 | *p*1 | *p*2 | *p*3 |
| *s*1 | 0 | 0.0157 | 0.0991 | 0.0687 | 0.0408 | 0.0151 |
| *s*2 | 0.0157 | 0 | 0.0834 | 0.0530 | 0.0251 | 0.0308 |
| *s*3 | 0.0991 | 0.0834 | 0 | 0.0304 | 0.0583 | 0.1142 |
| *p*1 | 0.0687 | 0.0530 | 0.0304 | 0 | 0.0279 | 0.0838 |
| *p*2 | 0.0408 | 0.0251 | 0.0583 | 0.0279 | 0 | 0.0559 |
| *p*3 | 0.0151 | 0.0308 | 0.1142 | 0.0838 | 0.0559 | 0 |

**Table 4.** Results of pairwise comparison of signals from the *S* family using DWT (×10-5)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Signal | *s*1 | *s*2 | *s*3 | *p*1 | *p*2 | *p*3 |
| *s*1 | 0 | 0.084 | 8898 | 5134 | 3184 | 1678 |
| *s*2 | 0.084 | 0 | 8888 | 5122 | 3172 | 1684 |
| *s*3 | 8898 | 8888 | 0 | 3766 | 5717 | 10572.0 |
| *p*1 | 5134 | 5122 | 3766 | 0 | 1951 | 6806 |
| *p*2 | 3184 | 3172 | 5717 | 1951 | 0 | 4855 |
| *p*3 | 1678 | 1684 | 105720 | 6806 | 4855 | 0 |

**Table 5.** Results of pairwise comparison of signals from the *S* family using CWT (×10-5)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Signal | *s*1 | *s*2 | *s*3 | *p*1 | *p*2 | *p*3 |
| *s*1 | 0 | 0 | 0.393 | 0.077 | 0.009 | 0.127 |
| *s*2 | 0 | 0 | 0.540 | 0.172 | 0.073 | 0.080 |
| *s*3 | 0.393 | 0.540 | 0 | 0.096 | 0.210 | 1.044 |
| *p*1 | 0.077 | 0.172 | 0.096 | 0 | 0.021 | 0.500 |
| *p*2 | 0.009 | 0.073 | 0.210 | 0.021 | 0 | 0.316 |
| *p*3 | 0.127 | 0.080 | 1044 | 0.500 | 0.316 | 0 |

The following tables 6, 7 and 8 present numerical scores reflecting the satisfaction of the recognition methods in terms of their compliance with criteria *C*1, *C*2 and *C*3 in the context of studying signals from the *S* family.

**Table 6.** Assessments reflecting the satisfaction of methods relative to criterion *C*1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Methods | Intermediate values obtained using (4) | Assessments (3) |
| DTW | 7.578 | 7.502 | 3.626 | 1.026 | 4.5299 | 7.578 |
| DDTW | 3.6679 | 2.9851 | 2.3923 | 1.0553 | 1.26913 | 3.6679 |
| FT | 0.0157 | 0.0834 | 0.0304 | 0.0279 | 0.0256 | 0.0834 |
| DWT | 8⋅10-7 | 8.81⋅10-5 | 3.76⋅10-5 | 1.95⋅10-5 | 1.51⋅10-5 | 8.81⋅10-5 |
| CWT | 0 | 3.9⋅10-6 | 3.2⋅10-6 | 0.7⋅10-6 | 1.2⋅10-6 | 3.9⋅10-6 |

**Table 7.** Assessments reflecting the satisfaction of methods relative to criterion *C*2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Методы | Intermediate values obtained using (5) | Assessments (6) |
| DTW | 3.7582 | 1.7783 | 2.2921 | 2.3191 | 3.7582 |
| DDTW | 1.7472 | 0.3333 | 0.6329 | 1.9987 | 1.9987 |
| FT | 0.0677 | 0.05296 | 0.0025 | 0.0280 | 0.0677 |
| DWT | 8.8⋅10-5 | 5.12⋅10-5 | 1.82⋅10-5 | 2.9⋅10-5 | 8.8⋅10-5 |
| CWT | 0.54⋅10-5 | 0.44⋅10-5 | 0.08⋅10-5 | 0.3⋅10-5 | 0.54⋅10-5 |

**Table 8.** Assessments reflecting the satisfaction of methods relative to criterion *C*3

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Методы | Intermediate values obtained using (7) | Assessments (8) |
| DTW | 1.5698 | 0.9178 | 1.3165 | 0.5025 | 0.5025 |
| DDTW | 1.3136 | 0.8015 | 1.5615 | 0.5513 | 0.5513 |
| FT | 2.6947 | 1.6839 | 1.4431 | 0.1586 | 0.1586 |
| DWT | 1.8974 | 1.6125 | 1.7332 | 0.0095 | 0.0095 |
| CWT | 0.0748 | 8.1310 | 5.09096 | 0.00076 | 0.00076 |

As can be seen from the obtained results, the recognition methods based on spectral analysis of signals are the best in terms of compliance with criteria *C*1, *C*2 and *C*3, which is confirmed by the corresponding significantly smaller numerical estimates in the last columns of tables 6, 7 and 8. Moreover, in the selected example of recognizing a voice signal voiced by a native speaker, the continuous wavelet transform demonstrates the best result in terms of recognition accuracy.

1. **Discussion**

Future advancements in speech recognition for the Azerbaijani language can be achieved through several approaches. One potential solution is the application of deep learning models such as convolutional neural networks (CNNs) and recurrent neural networks (RNNs), which have demonstrated high accuracy in other languages. Expanding the dataset with diverse speakers and tonal variations can also enhance model robustness. Additionally, the integration of self-supervised learning techniques can reduce the dependency on large labeled datasets. Another promising avenue is the use of hybrid models that combine traditional methods like DTW with machine learning-based approaches to improve recognition accuracy. Finally, developing context-aware recognition systems that incorporate natural language processing (NLP) could significantly refine recognition results by understanding speech in a broader linguistic context.

1. **Conclusion**

Using a trivial example of reproducing one word in the Azerbaijani language in three tones, the article formulates an approach to recognizing voice signals based on the combined use of five recognition methods. A promising system that combines different recognition methods will be able to respond to voice commands and perform tasks based on user actions. This is just one example of how one of the AI tools can be integrated into ordinary devices to make them more intuitive and able to interact with Azerbaijani citizens in natural language.

The calculations and results presented in the article were obtained using the author’s software of Associate Professor A.B. Kerimov, which was used in (Kerimov, 2022; Rzayev and Kerimov, 2023; Rzayev and Kerimov, 2024) and in writing a number of other peer-reviewed articles under the supervision of Professor R.R. Rzaev.
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