

Cepstral Peak Prominence Smoothed distribution as discriminator of vocal health in sustained vowel

Original

Cepstral Peak Prominence Smoothed distribution as discriminator of vocal health in sustained vowel / Castellana, Antonella; Carullo, Alessio; Corbellini, Simone; Astolfi, Arianna; M., Spadola Bisetti; J., Colombini. - ELETTRONICO. - Unico:(2017), pp. 552-557. (Intervento presentato al convegno 2017 IEEE International Instrumentation and Measurement Technology Conference tenutosi a Torino nel May, 22-25).

Availability:

This version is available at: 11583/2675359 since: 2017-06-29T11:43:43Z

Publisher:

Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE)

Published

DOI:

Terms of use:

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

Publisher copyright

(Article begins on next page)

Cepstral Peak Prominence Smoothed distribution as discriminator of vocal health in sustained vowel

A. Castellana, A. Carullo, S. Corbellini, A. Astolfi
Dipartimento di Elettronica e Telecomunicazioni e
Dipartimento di Energia
Politecnico di Torino, Torino, Italy
Email: antonella.castellana@polito.it

M. Spadola Bisetti, J. Colombini
Dipartimento di Scienze Chirurgiche
Università degli Studi di Torino, Torino, Italy
Email: massimo.spadolabisetti@unito.it

Abstract—This paper focuses on Cepstral Peak Prominence Smoothed (CPPS) as a possible indicator of vocal health status, considering individual CPPS distribution and its descriptive statistics. 31 voluntary patients and 22 control subjects performed the same protocol, which includes the simultaneous acquisition of three repetitions of the sustained vowel /a/ with a microphone in air and a contact sensor, the perceptual assessment of voice and the videolaryngoscopy examination. The best logistic regression models have been applied and preliminary results showed that the fifth percentile and the standard deviation of CPPS distributions are the best parameters that discriminate healthy and unhealthy voice for the microphone in air and the contact sensor, respectively. The Area Under Curve (AUC) revealed the diagnostic precision of the selected CPPS parameters: AUC of 0.96 and 0.83 have been found for the microphone in air and the contact sensor, showing strong to moderate discrimination power, respectively. The repeatability of the selected CPPS parameters has been also estimated. For each selected CPPS parameter, the Monte Carlo method has been implemented in order to evaluate the uncertainty of the threshold, which was identified by means of the Receiver Operating Curve analysis.

Keywords — *Dysphonia; Cepstral analysis; Sustained vowel; Repeatability; Monte Carlo method.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Objective assessment of voice overcomes the subjectivity due to the interpretation of symptoms and medical standards. One of the objective tools commonly employed is the voice acoustic analysis, which is used to assess voice disorders thanks to its non-invasiveness, low cost and ease of application [1]. It provides a numerical output that is relatively easy to communicate to all stakeholders, such as voice clinicians, patients, third-party payers, and physicians [2] and allows tracking of vocal behavior, proving to be appealing for dysphonia prevention, diagnosis, and dysphonia treatment.

Many researches have studied acoustic analysis algorithms and methods to obtain an objective analysis of dysphonia and its severity (see Buder for an overview [3]). Time-based parameters, such as *jitter* and *shimmer*, have been the first investigated ones. They depend on accurately identifying cycle boundaries, i.e. where a cycle of vocal-fold vibration begins and ends, so they become unreliable with highly perturbed signals [4]-[5]. Furthermore, such traditional perturbation

parameters are valid only for sustained vowels produced with steady pitch and loudness, since any purposeful changes will be read as increases in vocal perturbation [6]. To overcome the limitations of cycle boundary detection, current practice are considering spectral- and cepstral-based measures, which can be applied also to continuous speech that is able to represent everyday speaking patterns [7]. Among them, cepstral analysis has been considered as the most promising measure of dysphonia severity. According to the definition given by Hillenbrand and Houde [8], the cepstrum is a log power spectrum of a log power spectrum: the first power spectrum represents the frequency distribution of the signal energy, while the second spectrum shows how regular the harmonics peaks in the spectrum are. Two cepstral parameters have been defined, namely the Cepstral Peak Prominence (CPP) and its smoothed version (CPPS). CPP is a measure (in dB) of the amplitude of the cepstral peak, normalized for overall signal amplitude by means of linear regression line calculated relating frequency to cepstral magnitude [9]. CPPS derived from two smoothing processes before calculating the cepstral peak prominence [8]. Maryn et al. [10] highlighted the relevance of CPPS: they performed a meta-analysis on correlation coefficients between acoustic measurements and perceptual evaluation of voice quality, stating that CPPS satisfied the meta-analytic criteria in sustained vowels as well as in continuous speech. Other studies have demonstrated the correlation of CPPS with perceptual ratings of overall grade of dysphonia and different types of voice quality [11]-[16]. Brinca et al. [17] assessed that CPPS measures were significantly different between dysphonic and control group in the vowel /a/, but in the existing literature there is a lack of investigations on diagnostic precision of CPPS. Such analysis has been done for multi-parametric indexes, e.g. the Acoustic Voice Quality Index (AVQI), which is a multivariate construct with CPPS and other four acoustic parameters [18]. All the above-mentioned works used cepstrum software packages to calculate CPPS from signals acquired with microphones in air. *Praat* [19], *SpeechTool* [20] and the Analysis of Dysphonia in Speech and Voice module [21] of *Multi-Speech* from KayPENTAX (Montvale, NJ) are the most popular packages. These programs only provide the mean of CPPS values and in some cases the standard deviation.

Recently, in-clinic short-term measurements have been replaced by in-field long-term monitorings, which allow for the characterization of the vocal behavior with distributional parameters [22]. Proper devices for such vocal monitoring have

been developed, which are equipped with a contact sensor that allows minimizing the effects of sound sources different from the voice of interest and does not impair the subject activity: the NCVS dosimeter [23], the VoxLog [24], the Ambulatory Phonation Monitor [25], the Voice Care [26]-[28] and a smartphone-based platform [29]. A recent work by Mehta et al. [30] investigated the relationship between vocal measures from vowels acquired with a microphone in air and an accelerometer sensor. They calculated CPP with a commercially available program and they found that CPP measures from the two signals were highly correlated, but no differences between healthy and unhealthy voice were found.

The present study investigates CPPS distributions in sustained vowel /a/ and their descriptive statistics as discriminators between healthy and unhealthy voices, assuming that descriptive statistics different than the mean could have a good discrimination power. Such analysis has been done for signals acquired with two types of microphones: a headworn microphone and a contact electret condenser microphone (ECM). The intra-speaker variability of CPPS parameters has been determined in repeated measures and the variability of the threshold values between healthy and unhealthy voices has been assessed by means of the Monte Carlo method.

II. METHOD

A. Subjects

Thirty-one voluntary patients, 22 females and 9 males, participated in this study (age range: 20-77 years; mean: 49.5 years; standard deviation SD: 17.4 years). Twenty-two healthy adults with normal voices, 4 females and 18 males, were also included in the experiment (age range: 21-49 years; mean: 28.9 years; SD: 11.1 years). All subjects were native Italian speakers. Diagnosis for all the participants were made on the basis of a clinical protocol that included a careful case history, auditory-perceptual measures, and videostroboscopy. Table I summarizes the otolaryngologic diagnoses and their amounts in the patient group.

B. Procedure

The protocol was designed in order to avoid each step affecting the following one. The relevant steps of the procedure can be summarized as follows:

- (1) each participant was asked to vocalize the sustained vowel /a/ on a comfortable pitch and loudness until he/she had need to breathe again, while he/she worn a headworn microphone and a contact microphone simultaneously;
- (2) participants repeated the previous task other two times, waiting few seconds of silence between the repetitions;
- (3) two otolaryngologists performed the clinical practice that included a careful case history, auditory-perceptual measures (GIRBAS scale) and the videolaryngoscopy examination.

The vowel /a/ was selected as speech material due to its large use in acoustic analysis of voice, as recommended in

TABLE I. Diagnoses for the patient group

Organic dysphonia	N. Patients
Cyst	5
Edema	8
Sulcus vocalis	3
Polyp	3
Chronic laryngitis	3
Vocal fold hypostenia	2
Vocal fold paresis	1
Vocal fold nodul	1
Neurological disorder	3
Post-surgery dysphonia	2
<i>Overall</i>	<i>31</i>

[32]. The duration of each phonation was always longer than 2 s, as recommended in [33].

C. Equipment for recording procedure

The voice recordings were performed in a quiet room, where the A-weighted equivalent background noise level was measured with a calibrated class-1 sound level meter (NTi Audio XL2) over a period of 5 minutes in four different days, obtaining the average value of 51.0 dB (SD = 3 dB). Before performing the tasks described in steps (1) and (2), subjects worn the two microphones, that were:

- an omni-directional headworn microphone Mipro MU-55HN, which was placed at a distance of about 2.5 cm from the lips' edges of the talker, slightly to the side of the mouth. The microphone, which exhibits a flatness of ± 3 dB in the range from 40 Hz to 20 kHz, was connected to a bodypack transmitter ACT-30T, which transmits to a wireless system Mipro ACT 311. The output signal of this system was recorded with a handy recorder ZOOM H1 (Zoom Corp., Tokyo, Japan), that use a sample rate of 44.1 kHz and 16 bit of resolution;
- an Electret Condenser Microphone (ECM AE38 [Alan Electronics GmbH (Dreieich, Germany)]), which was fixed at the jugular notch of each talker by means of a surgical band. The microphone senses the skin vibrations induced by the vocal-fold activity and it was connected to the handy recorder ROLAND R05 (Roland Corp., Milano, Italy), that samples the signal at a rate of 44.1 kHz using 16 bit of resolution.

Table II shows the details related to the subjects who performed the experimental task with the two microphones.

D. Data processing

After each recording, data was downloaded from the handy recorders and stored in a Personal Computer in order to be post-processed. First, a suitable portion of the sustained /a/ samples has been selected for the features extraction, that is in the phonation interval from 1 s to 6 s. This preliminary operation has been performed using the software Adobe Audition (version 3.0). Then, we have developed a specific

TABLE II. Number of subjects who undertook the experiments with the different devices Mipro MU-55HN headworn microphone and ECM AE38 contact microphone. Number of patients and controls and females (F) and males (M) are also reported.

	Mipro MU-55HN			ECM AE38		
	F	M	Overall	F	M	Overall
Patients	22	9	31	19	5	24
Controls	4	18	22	4	18	22
Overall	26	27	53	13	25	46

MATLAB (R2014b, version 8.4) script that is able to calculate the Cepstral Peak Prominence Smoothed (CPPS) according to the definition given by Hillenbrand et al. [8]. The selected portion of signal was down-sampled to 22050 Hz and the CPPS has been estimated every 2 ms (frame) using a 1024-point (46 ms) analysis window. For each window the following steps have been performed: starting from the signal in the time domain, the Fast Fourier Transform (FFT) algorithm has been implemented in order to obtain the spectrum amplitude; then, the FFT algorithm has been implemented again on the log power spectrum obtaining the cepstrum. Before extracting the cepstral peak, the cepstra corresponding to each analysis window are smoothed according to the following two-step procedure: cepstra are time averaged using a time-smoothing window of 14 ms (7 frames) and then the cepstral-magnitude average is obtained across quefrency with a seven-bin averaging window. After the smoothing steps, a regression line has been calculated in the quefrency vs cepstral magnitude domain between 1 ms and the maximum quefrency, as suggested in [9]. Quefrequencies below 1 ms are more affected by the spectral envelope, which vary slowly, than by the spectrum periodicity [31]. Eventually, the Cepstral Peak Prominence Smoothed (CPPS) has been evaluated as the difference in dB between the peak in the cepstrum domain and the value of the regression line at the same quefrency. Since the quefrency at the cepstral peak generally corresponds to the inverse of the fundamental frequency, which is usually in the range from 60 Hz to 300 Hz, the cepstral peak has been looked for in the range from 3.3 ms to 16.7 ms.

A time series of 2500 CPPS values (5000 ms/2 ms) is available for each speech sample, which is treated as a distribution, as can be observed in Fig. 1. For each CPPS




Fig. 1. Two examples of CPPS distributions, which have been obtained from the monitoring of a sustained vowel /a/ acquired with the headworn microphone: healthy voice shows a symmetric distribution with a higher mean (left side); unhealthy voice has a distribution with a negative skewness and a lower mean (right side).

distribution, the following descriptive statistics have been calculated: mean ($CPPS_{mean}$), median ($CPPS_{median}$), mode ($CPPS_{mode}$), 5th percentile ($CPPS_{5prc}$) and 95th percentile ($CPPS_{95prc}$) as measures of location of the distribution; standard deviation ($CPPS_{std}$) and the interval between the maximum and the minimum value ($CPPS_{int}$) as measures of its variance, kurtosis ($CPPS_{kurt}$) and skewness ($CPPS_{skew}$) for the characterization of distribution shape.

E. Analysis

1) CPPS parameters in healthy and unhealthy voices

Statistical differences between each coupled list of descriptive statistics related to the group of patient and control subjects have been investigated using the two-tailed Mann-Whitney U-test, which is a non-parametric test based on independent samples [34]. The test does not require any specific assumptions on the distributions and the null hypothesis (H_0) states that $MD = 0$, where MD is the median of the population of the differences between the sample data for the two group of patients and controls. If the null hypothesis is accepted, the two lists of values seems to come from the same population, i.e. it is not possible to distinguish healthy and unhealthy samples. The one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test verified that data in each list did not come from a normal distribution, except for the kurtosis values of the CPPS distributions ($CPPS_{kurt}$) obtained from the patient group, thus justifying the use of a non-parametric test for the analysis. The two above-mentioned tests have been performed using the program MATLAB (R2014b, version 8.4).

2) Best logistic regression model

In order to deeply investigate the effectiveness of the selected descriptive statistics for CPPS distribution as discriminator between dysphonic and healthy voices, a binary classification approach has been implemented. Firstly, each individual value of the descriptive statistics for CPPS distribution have been labeled with a dichotomous variable, which has been coded as 0 or 1, representing the absence or the presence of dysphonic voice for each subject, respectively. The absence or the presence of the characteristic has been checked according to the outcome that was obtained from the videolarngoscopy examination. A single-variable logistic regression model has been performed for each descriptive statistic and the best model was selected based on the highest Mc Fadden's R^2 and Area Under Curve (AUC) [35]. The Mc Fadden's R^2 is one of the so-called pseudo R^2 , which are used to characterize the predictive power of a logistic regression model. The area under the Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curve represents a description of classification accuracy of the model. Area Under Curve (AUC) is a numerical indicator of ROC analysis, which ranges from 0.5 to 1.0, and it provides a measure of the model's ability to discriminate between those subjects with vocal problems versus those who have a healthy voice. An AUC close to 1 indicates a strong discriminatory power, while an AUC close to 0.5 indicates that the model has a poor ability to separate the two groups. Furthermore, we selected the optimal cutoff point for the purposes of classification, plotting sensitivity and specificity versus each possible cutoff point in the same graph. *Sensitivity*, that is the true positive rate, is the proportion of subjects with

voice disorders who are correctly identified as positive. *Specificity*, that is the true negative rate, is the percentage of people with healthy normal voice who are correctly classified as negative. The authors avoid the usual choice of selecting where the sensitivity and specificity curves cross, since they selected the cutoff giving priority to the sensitivity that corresponds to a greater true positive rate. All the analysis related to the logistic regression model has been performed using the statistical program RStudio (Version 0.99.489).

3) Intra-speaker variability

With the purpose of investigating the repeatability of the descriptive statistics for CPPS distribution that have been included in the empirical fitted models, CPPS distributions have been calculated in the three repetitions of the sustained vowel /a/ for each subject. Forty subjects repeated correctly the second task described in paragraph II.B, while wearing both the headworn microphone and the ECM.

4) Monte Carlo method

The Monte Carlo method has been implemented for the uncertainty estimation of the threshold values, which have been obtained for each empirical fitted model by means of the ROC analysis. The Maximum Likelihood Estimation has been implemented in MATLAB in order to determine the best fitting distribution for the distributions of CPPS parameters that were included in the models, both in healthy and unhealthy voices. In this analysis, the values of the CPPS parameters in the three repetitions of the vowel for each subject have been considered. Then, 1000 trials have been repeated by randomly sampling 50 values from each fitted distribution. For each Monte Carlo trial the best threshold value of the logistic model has been determined, setting the equality between the sensitivity and the specificity that were obtained from the ROC analysis.

III. RESULTS

A. Microphone in air

The p -values of the Two-tailed Mann-Whitney U-test of the lists of descriptive statistics related to the two groups of subjects were lower than 0.05, which means null hypotheses rejected, except for skewness and kurtosis. These outcomes reveal that CPPS distributions are significantly different in location, with an average value of 15.4 dB and 18.4 dB for $CPPS_{mean}$ in patients and controls, respectively, and in variance, with an average value of 2.0 dB and 1.3 dB for $CPPS_{std}$ in patients and controls, respectively.

We assumed the presence/absence of dysphonia as dependent variable and the best logistic regression model between healthy and unhealthy voice includes $CPPS_{5prc}$ as independent variable. The best empirical fitted model is defined in terms of probability by the exponential expression:

$$P(Unhealthy) = \frac{e^{(28.1 - 1.87 \cdot CPPS_{5prc})}}{1 + e^{(28.1 - 1.87 \cdot CPPS_{5prc})}} \quad (1)$$

where $P(Unhealthy)$ is the probability of having unhealthy voice, which ranges from zero to one. The negative coefficient of $CPPS_{5prc}$ shows that the probability to have unhealthy voice decreases as the $CPPS_{5prc}$ increases. The empirical model has a

Mc Fadden's R^2 equal to 0.63 and an AUC of 0.96, thus highlighting that there is a clear separation between patients and controls. Fig. 2 shows the fitted values obtained for each subject and most of patients are in the upper part of the graph, where the probability of having unhealthy voice is near to one, while most of controls have lower scores, near to zero. We also calculated the best classification threshold of $P(Unhealthy) = 0.48$, that corresponds to 15.1 dB in terms of $CPPS_{5prc}$, with a sensitivity equal to 0.94 and a specificity of 0.86.

Fig. 3 shows the average values and the relative experimental standard deviations of $CPPS_{5prc}$ in the three repetitions of the vowel /a/ acquired with the headworn microphone for each subject. The average of the standard deviations of the $CPPS_{5prc}$ is equal to 1.0 dB for the patient group and 0.4 dB for the control group.

The best-fitted distributions of the parameter $CPPS_{5prc}$ for unhealthy and healthy voices acquired with the microphone in air are bimodal and normal, respectively. Their probability density functions have been used for the implementation of the Monte Carlo method. Fig. 4 shows the distribution of threshold-values, which has been obtained from 1000 trials. It




Fig. 2. Fitted values of the best logistic regression model, in terms of probability of having unhealthy voice, for vocalizations acquired with the headworn microphone Mipro MU-55HN. Cross points indicate the patient group; diamond points represent the control group. The bold line indicates the threshold value (0.48), which best separates patients and control subjects.




Fig. 3. Averaged values of $CPPS_{5prc}$ in the three repetitions of the vowel for each subject, acquired with the headworn microphone Mipro MU-55HN. Cross points indicate the patient group; diamond points represent the control group. Bars indicate the experimental standard deviation for each subject. The bold line indicates the threshold value (15.1 dB) and the gray area corresponds to its confidence interval obtained with a coverage factor $k = 2$.




Fig. 4. Distribution of threshold-values between healthy and unhealthy voices for $CPPS_{5prc}$. It has been obtained from 1000 trials of the Monte Carlo method.

has a standard deviation of 0.18 dB that represents the standard uncertainty estimation of the $CPPS_{5prc}$ threshold value between healthy and unhealthy voices. The gray area around the $CPPS_{5prc}$ threshold in the Fig. 3 represents the confidence interval obtained with a coverage factor $k = 2$.

B. Contact microphone

The Two-tailed Mann-Whitney U-test stated that the lists of descriptive statistics for CPPS distributions related to the groups of patients and control subjects, who was recorded with ECM, resulted to be significantly different in $CPPS_{mean}$, $CPPS_{std}$, $CPPS_{range}$ and $CPPS_{5prc}$ (p -values < 0.05). CPPS distributions were different in location, e.g. the average $CPPS_{mean}$ was equal to 18.2 dB for patients and 19.6 dB for controls, and in variance, e.g. the average $CPPS_{std}$ was equal to 1.8 dB and 1.0 dB for patients and controls, respectively.

The best empirical fitted logistic model for voice samples acquired with ECM includes $CPPS_{std}$ as independent variable and it is expressed as:

$$P(Unhealthy) = \frac{e^{(-5.31 + 4.60 \cdot CPPS_{std})}}{1 + e^{(-5.31 + 4.60 \cdot CPPS_{std})}} \quad (2)$$

where $P(Unhealthy)$ is the probability of having unhealthy voice, which ranges from zero to one. The positive coefficient of $CPPS_{std}$ shows that the probability to have unhealthy voice increases as $CPPS_{std}$ increases. The empirical model has a moderate discrimination power, with a Mc Fadden's R^2 equal to 0.31 and an AUC of 0.83. Therefore, Fig. 5 shows that the fitted values of the two groups are not clearly separated. The best classification threshold is $P(Unhealthy) = 0.43$, that corresponds to 1.1 dB in terms of $CPPS_{std}$, with a sensitivity of 0.79 and a specificity of 0.59.

Fig. 6 shows the average values and the relative experimental standard deviations of $CPPS_{std}$ in the three repetitions of the vowel /a/ acquired with the ECM for each subject. The average of the standard deviations of the $CPPS_{std}$ is equal to 0.3 dB for the patient group and 0.2 dB for the control group.




Fig. 5. Fitted values of the best logistic regression model, in terms of probability of having unhealthy voice, for samples acquired with the contact microphone ECM AE38. Cross points indicate the patient group; diamond points represent the control group. The bold line indicates the selected threshold value, that is 0.43, which best separates patients and control subjects.




Fig. 6. Averaged values of $CPPS_{std}$ in the three repetitions of the vowel for each subject, acquired with the contact microphone ECM AE38. Cross points indicate the patient group; diamond points represent the control group. Bars indicate the experimental standard deviation for each subject. The bold line indicates the threshold value (1.1 dB) and the gray area corresponds to its confidence interval obtained with a coverage factor $k = 2$.

The best-fitted distributions of the parameter $CPPS_{std}$ for unhealthy and healthy voices acquired with ECM are bimodal and lognormal, respectively. Their probability density functions have been used for the implementation of the Monte Carlo method. The distribution of threshold-values, which has been obtained from 1000 trials, has a standard deviation of 0.04 dB that represents the standard uncertainty estimation of the threshold value of $CPPS_{std}$ between healthy and unhealthy voices. The gray area around the $CPPS_{std}$ threshold in the Fig. 6 represents the confidence interval obtained with a coverage factor $k = 2$.

IV. CONCLUSION

In this work, the descriptive statistics from individual distribution of Cepstral Peak Prominence Smoothed (CPPS) have been investigated as possible indicators of vocal health status. CPPS has been computed for sustained vowels /a/ acquired with a microphone in air and a contact sensor (ECM) from a patient group and a control group. The fifth percentile ($CPPS_{5prc}$) of individual CPPS distributions resulted the best descriptive statistic that discriminates healthy and unhealthy

voices for the vocal samples acquired with the microphone in air, showing a strong discrimination power (AUC = 0.96). Its threshold value was equal to 15.1 dB, with lower values indicating unhealthy status of voice. The standard deviation (CPPS_{std}) was instead the best CPPS parameter that separates the two groups for the vocal samples acquired with ECM. It has a moderate discrimination power, with AUC of 0.83. Differently from the results by Mehta et al. [30], the proposed method is able to classify healthy and unhealthy voice from both the microphone in air and ECM. Further investigations are needed to identify the reasons of the lower discrimination power found for ECM, which could be due to the different frequency behavior of the two microphones (flatness and/or bandwidth), as highlighted in [26].

The intra-speaker variability of the two CPPS parameters was larger in the patients group than in the control one, as expected; its respective values were 1.0 dB and 0.4 dB for CPPS_{5prc} and 0.2 dB and 0.3 dB for CPPS_{std}.

Preliminary results showed that the standard uncertainty of the threshold values between healthy and unhealthy voices is negligible for both the CPPS_{5prc} and CPPS_{std}, which is equal of 0.18 dB and 0.04 dB, respectively.

Future works will extend the investigation to the descriptive statistics from individual distribution of CPPS in continuous speech acquired with the two types of sensor.

REFERENCES

- [1] V. Parsa, D.G. Jamieson, "Acoustic discrimination of pathological voice: sustained vowels versus continuous speech," *J. Speech Lang. Hear. Res.*, vol. 44, pp. 327–339, 2001.
- [2] L.G. Portney, M.P. Watkins, *Foundations of Clinical Research: Applications to Practice*, 2 Ed., Upper Saddle River, Prentice-Hall, 2000.
- [3] E.H. Buder, Acoustic analysis of voice quality: a tabulation of algorithms 1902–1990. In: R.D. Kent, M.J. Ball, eds. *Voice Quality Measurement*, San Diego, CA: Singular Publishing Group, 2000, pp.119–244.
- [4] C.R. Rabinov, J. Kreiman, B. Gerratt and S. Bielamowicz, "Comparing reliability of perceptual ratings of roughness and acoustic measures of jitter," *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, vol. 38, pp. 26–32, 1995.
- [5] S. Bielamowicz, J. Kreiman, B. R. Gerratt, M. S. Dauer and G. S. Berke, "Comparison of voice analysis systems for perturbation measurement," *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, vol. 39, 126–134, 1996.
- [6] Y. Zhang and J.J. Jiang, "Acoustic analyses of sustained and running voices from patients with laryngeal pathologies," *J Voice*, vol. 22, 1–9, 2008.
- [7] S.Y. Lowell, R.H. Colton, R.T. Kelley, Y.C. Hahn, "Spectral- and cepstral-based measures during continuous speech: capacity to distinguish dysphonia and consistency within a speaker", *J Voice*, vol. 25, pp.223–232, 2011.
- [8] J. Hillenbrand, R.A. Houde, "Acoustic correlates of breathy vocal quality: dysphonic voices and continuous speech," *J. Speech Hear Res.*, vol. 39(2), pp. 311–21, 1996.
- [9] J. Hillenbrand, R.A. Cleveland, R.L. Erickson, "Acoustic correlates of breathy vocal quality," *J Speech Hear Res*, vol. 37, pp. 769–778, 1994.
- [10] Y. Maryn, N. Roy, M. De Bodt, P. Van Cauwenberge, P. Corthals, "Acoustic measurement of overall voice quality: a meta-analysis," *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, vol. 126, pp. 2619–2634, 2009.
- [11] V. Wolfe, D. Martin, "Acoustic correlates of dysphonia: type and severity," *J. Commun. Disord.*, vol. 30, pp. 403–415, 1997.
- [12] Y.D. Heman-Ackah, D.D. Michael, G.S. Goding, "The relationship between cepstral peak prominence and selected parameters of dysphonia", *J Voice*, vol.16, pp. 20–27, 2002.
- [13] Y.D. Heman-Ackah, R.J. Heuer, D.D. Michael, R. Ostrowski, M. Horman, M.M. Baroody, J. Hillenbrand, R.T. Sataloff, "Cepstral peak prominence: a more reliable measure of dysphonia," *Ann. Otol. Rhinol. Laryngol.*, vol.112, pp. 324–333, 2003.
- [14] B. Halberstam, "Acoustic and perceptual parameters relating to connected speech are more reliable measures of hoarseness than parameters relating to sustained vowels," *J. Otorhinol. Relat. Spec.*, vol. 66, pp.70–73, 2004.
- [15] C. Moers, B. Möbius, F. Rosanowski, E. Nöth, U. Eysholdt, T. Haderlein, "Vowel- and text-based cepstral analysis of chronic hoarseness," *J. Voice*, vol.26, pp.416–424, 2012.
- [16] R.A. Samlan, B.H. Story, K. Bunton, "Relation of perceived breathiness to laryngeal kinematics and acoustic measures based on computational modeling," *J. Speech Lang. Hear. Res.*, vol.56, pp. 1209–1223, 2013.
- [17] L.F. Brinca, P.F. Batista, A.I. Tavares, I.C. Goncalves, M.L. Moreno, "Use of Cepstral Analyses for Differentiating Normal From Dysphonic Voices: A Comparative Study of Connected Speech Versus Sustained Vowel in European Portuguese Female Speakers," *J Voice*, vol. 28 (3), pp. 282–286, 2014.
- [18] Y. Maryn, M. De Bodt, N. Roy, "The acoustic voice quality index: toward improved treatment outcomes assessment in voice disorders," *J. Commun. Disord.*, vol. 43, pp.161–174, 2010.
- [19] P. Boersma and D. Weenink, Institute of Phonetic Sciences, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands, [http:// www.praat.org/](http://www.praat.org/). (last view: 31/10/2016).
- [20] J.M. Hillenbrand, James M. Hillenbrand Homepage, [Online] Available at: <http://homepages.wmich.edu/~hillenbr/> (last view: 31/10/2016).
- [21] S.N. Awan, N. Roy, M.E. Jette, G.S. Meltzner, R.E. Hillman, "Quantifying dysphonia severity using a sepctral/cepstral-based acoustic index: comparisons with auditory-perceptual judgements from the CAPE-V," *Clin. Linguist. Phon.*, vol.24, pp.742–758, 2010.
- [22] M. Ghassemi, J.H. Van Stan, D.D. Mehta, M. Zanartu, H.A. Cheyne, R.E. Hillman, J.V. Gutttag, "Learning to Detect Vocal Hyperfunction From Ambulatory Neck-Surface Acceleration Features: Initial Results for Vocal Fold Nodules," *IEEE Tr. on Biomedical Engineering*, vol. 61(6), pp. 1668-1675, 2014.
- [23] P.S. Popolo, J.G. Svec, and I.R. Titze, "Adaptation of a Pocket PC for Use as a Wearable Voice Dosimeter," *Journal of Speech Language and Hearing Research*, vol. 48, pp. 780-791, 2005.
- [24] VoxLog portable voice meter [online] available: <http://www.sonvox.com/index.html>. (last view: 31/10/2016).
- [25] H.A. Cheyne, H.M. Hanson, R.P. Genereux, K.N. Stevens and R.E. Hillman, "Development and Testing of a Portable Vocal Accumulator," *J. of Speech Lang. and Hear Research*, vol. 46, pp. 1457-1467, 2003.
- [26] A. Carullo, A. Vallan, and A. Astolfi, "Design Issues for a Portable Vocal Analyzer", *IEEE Tr. on IM*, vol. 62(5), pp. 1084-1093, 2013.
- [27] A. Carullo, A. Vallan, and A. Astolfi, "A Low-Cost Platform for Voice Monitoring", in *Proceedings of I2MTC Conference*, Minneapolis, MN (USA), May 6-9 2013.
- [28] A. Carullo, A. Vallan, A. Astolfi, G.E. Puglisi, L. Pavese, "Validation of calibration procedures and uncertainty estimation of contact-microphone based vocal analyzers," *Measurement*, vol. 74, pp. 130-142, 2015.
- [29] D.D. Mehta, M. Zaartu, S.W. Feng, H.A Cheyne, R.E. Hillman, "Mobile Voice Health Monitoring Using a Wearable Accelerometer Sensor and a Smartphone Platform," *IEEE Tr. on Biomedical Engineering*, vol. 59(11), pp. 3090-3096, 2012.
- [30] D.D. Mehta, J.H. Van Stan, R.E.Hillman, "Relationships between vocal function measures derived from an acoustic microphone and a subglottal neck-surface accelerometer," *IEEE/ACM Trans Audio Speech Lang Process.*, vol. 24(4), pp. 659-668, 2016.
- [31] G. de Krom, "A cepstrum-based technique for determining a harmonics to noise ratio in speech signals," *J. S. Hear. Res.*, vol. 36, pp. 254-266, 1993.
- [32] P. Gramming, "Vocal loudness and frequency capabilities of the voice", *J. Voice*, vol. 5, pp. 144-157, 1991.
- [33] R.F. Coleman, "Sources of variation in phonetograms," *J. Voice*, vol. 7, pp. 1-14, 1993.
- [34] J.D. Gibbons and S. Chakraborti, "Nonparametric Statistical Inference," Taylor & Francis, 2003, pp. 215-223.
- [35] D. Hosmer, S. Lemeshow, R. Sturdivant, "Applied Logistic Regression," third edition, Wiley, 2013.