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## 1. Introduction

Research Question: How do Google and Microsoft's ASR API compare when ran on native Dutch child and teenager speech?

## Child Speech Recognition (CSR):

- Accurate ASR is challenging but necessary.
- Crucial for applications aimed at younger people
- Children make up a large portion of the userbase.
- Create a baseline


## Google and Microsoft:

- Largest companies with ASR systems.
- Comparing for potential future improvements.
- Relevant to a large number of people.
-Reference for choosing a fitting ASR system.


## 2. Method

## Jasmin-CGN:

| Category | Groups |
| :---: | :---: |
| Gender | Male (M), Female (F) |
| Age | Child, Teenager |
| Dialect | N1b, N2c, N3b, N4a |

Metrics:

- Word Error Rate (WER):
$W E R=\frac{\text { Substitutions }+ \text { Insertions }+ \text { Deletions }}{\text { Number of words spoken }} * 100 \%$
- Character Error Rate (CER):
$C E R=\frac{\text { Substitutions }+ \text { Insertions }+ \text { Deletions }}{\text { Number of characters spoken }} * 100 \%$


## Experiment:

- Segment files.
- Run all segments on both systems.
-Turn results into dataframe.
- Remove noise files and calculate the errors.


## 3. Results

The results indicate that Microsoft's ASR generally performs better in terms of WER across all demographics, while Google's ASR shows slightly better results in CER.

| Metric | Child | Teen | Female | Male | N1b | N2c | N3b | N4a |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Google <br> WER | 31.55 | 22.37 | 26.34 | 27.55 | 21.49 | 29.38 | 29.38 | 27.58 |
| Microsoft | $\mathbf{2 6 . 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 . 4 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 . 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 . 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 . 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 . 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 . 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 . 0 2}$ |
| Google <br> CER | $\mathbf{2 0 . 3 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 . 7 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 . 3 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 . 7 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 . 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 . 7 6}$ | 19.23 | $\mathbf{1 9 . 2 2}$ |
| Microsoft | 21.89 | 17.21 | 19.12 | 19.96 | 16.76 | 21.77 | $\mathbf{1 9 . 1 4}$ | 20.80 |



## 5. Conclusion and future work

Conclusions:

- Microsoft in terms of WER.
- Google in terms of CER
- Both bias towards teenagers compared to children.
- Both bias towards N1b compared to all other regions.
- Both slightly bias towards women compared to men.
- Overall Google is slightly less bias in terms of WER and CER


## Shortcomings:

- More metrics such as Phoneme Error Rate (PER)
- More data.

