Corrections for Section VI-A4

4) Experiment results: Tables IV and V show the DERs of the diarization systems without and with the Vitrebi re-segmentation based post processing step, respectively. From these two tables, two observations can be drawn. First, a more accurate speaker change detection algorithm leads to better diarization accuracy. For example, FixSlid_HAC obtains a higher DER than the other systems. As shown in Fig. 16, its segmentation method, FixSlid, achieves a higher segmentation error. Second, Vitrebi re-segmentation consistently improves the diarization accuracy of all the systems. The improvement is more significant on FixSlid_HAC, which achieves a higher DER originally; however, its DER is still higher than those of the other systems that are based on more accurate speaker segmentation methods.

TABLE IV

DERS (IN %) OF DIFFERENT DIARIZATION SYSTEMS. VITERBI RE-SEGMENTATION IS NOT APPLIED

Approach	RT03_Dev				RT03_Eval			
	MiS	FaS	SpE	DER	MiS	FaS	SpE	DER
SeqDACDec1_HAC	0.6	0.4	7.9	8.86	0	4	9.3	13.34
SeqDACDec2_HAC	0.6	0.4	7.7	8.7	0	4	9.4	13.39
DACDec3_HAC	0.6	0.4	7.5	8.46	0	4	9.7	13.69
WinGrow_HAC	0.6	0.4	8.3	9.29	0	4	10.1	14.12
DISTBIC_pR_HAC	0.6	0.4	8.2	9.19	0	4	9.9	13.94
FixSlid_HAC	0.6	0.4	10.5	11.52	0	4	13.3	17.57

TABLE V

DERS (IN %) OF DIFFERENT DIARIZATION SYSTEMS. VITERBI RE-SEGMENTATION IS APPLIED AS A POST PROCESSING STEP

Approach	RT03_Dev				RT03_Eval			
	MiS	FaS	SpE	DER	MiS	FaS	SpE	DER
SeqDACDec1_HAC	0.6	0.4	7.4	8.37	0	4	9.2	13.15
SeqDACDec2_HAC	0.6	0.4	7.4	8.35	0	4	9.2	13.16
DACDec3_HAC	0.6	0.4	7	7.96	0	4	9.7	13.67
WinGrow_HAC	0.6	0.4	7.7	8.65	0	4	9.8	13.79
DISTBIC_pR_HAC	0.6	0.4	7.5	8.51	0	4	9.1	13.06
FixSlid_HAC	0.6	0.4	8.2	9.22	0	4	10.9	14.91